

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 90-550
H. R. 17023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of H. R. 17023,	.1
Digest of Public Law 90-550	.2

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. R. 17023

May	3, 1968	House Appropriations Committee reported H. R. 17023. House Report 1348. Print of bill and report.
May	7, 1968	House Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 17023. H. Res. 1164. Print of resolution and report.
May	8, 1968	House passed H. R. 17023 with amendments.
May	10, 1968	H. R. 17023 was referred to Senate Appropriations Committee. Print of H. R. 17023 as referred.
June	27, 1968	Senate subcommittee approved H. R. 17023 for full committee consideration .
July	9, 1968	Senate committee voted to report H. R. 17023.
July	10, 1968	Senate committee reported H. R. 17023 with amendments. Senate Report 1375. Print of bill and report.
July	17, 1968	Senate began debate on H. R. 17023.
July	18, 1968	Senate passed H. R. 17023 with amendments. Senate conferees were appointed. Print of bill as passed Senate with amendments numbered.
Sept.	9, 1968	House conferees were appointed.
Sept.	18, 1968	House received conference report.
Sept.	19, 1968	House agreed to conference report.
Sept.	25, 1968	Senate agreed to conference report.
Oct.	4, 1968	Approved: Public Law 90-550.

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued May 7, 1968
For actions of May 6, 1968
90th-2nd; No. 76

CONTENTS

Aging.....12	Foreign affairs.....44	Property.....40
Appropriations.....7,23,50	Foreign aid....15,22,25,49	Public Law 480.....51
Arts and humanities.....17	Forest roads.....38,42	Public works.....48
Budget.....52	Foreign trade.....8,33	Reclamation.....34,53
Budgeting.....47	Forests.....2,3,4,20	Redwood Park.....20
Buildings.....36	Health services.....11	Research.....41
Commission.....37	Highways.....38	Revenue bonds.....14
Conservation.....38	Holidays.....6	Rural America.....37
Consumer affairs.....10	Housing.....31	Selective service.....9,35
Education.....18	Kerr Memorial.....3	Small business.....19
Expenditures.....1,27	Lands.....4	Taxation.....1,14,27
Farm bargaining.....29	Mexico.....13	Veterans benefits....32,45
Farm income.....28	Military construction...43	Vocational
Farm labor.....11	Opinion polls.....21	rehabilitation.....5
Farm program.....23,28	Pay raise.....26	Water.....34
Feed grain.....39	Personnel.....32	Weather.....41
Fiscal year.....30	Pine gum.....46	Wilderness.....2
Flood control.....48	Poverty.....24	Wheat.....39
Food supplements.....16	Price supports.....39	

HIGHLIGHTS: House received President's taxation-expenditures message. House Ways and Means Committee announced bargaining position on taxation-expenditures bill. House passed San Gabriel Wilderness bill. House passed Kerr Memorial bill.

HOUSE

1. TAXATION; EXPENDITURES. Received the President's message requesting passage of a tax bill and stating that he would accept the House Appropriations Committee's formula on H. R. 15414, the taxation-expenditures bill, including a \$4 billion reduction in 1969 expenditures, but that "it would be a serious mistake to go beyond that formula" (H. Doc. 305); to Ways and Means Committee. pp. H3334-5

The Ways and Means Committee announced that it had adopted the following position regarding H. R. 15414:

"(1) That it is the view of the Committee on Ways and Means that budget expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, should be reduced by at least \$4 billion (excepting special Vietnam costs, interest on the debt, veterans' benefits, and Social Security Trust Funds, in excess of amounts estimated in the budget);

"(2) That the chairman and the House conferees are requested to negotiate within the conference on an appropriate limitation on expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969;

"(3) That there should be a reduction of at least \$10 billion in new obligational authority and a rescission of at least \$8 billion in old authority; and

"(4) That the Committee on Ways and Means further considers, as a part of the foregoing, that appropriate income tax increases (either through a 10-percent surcharge or comparable rate adjustments) should be developed by the conferees on H. R. 15414 to yield approximately \$10 billion in a full year of operation to become a part of the combined expenditure-tax action to be embodied in the conference report on the bill, H. R. 15414."

Rep. McCormack inserted "Talking Points on the Tax Increase," a memorandum from the Council of Economic Advisers to the President. p. H3392

Several members discussed the President's request for a tax increase, etc. pp. H3333-4

2. WILDERNESS. Passed without amendment S. 2531, to designate the San Gabriel Wilderness, Angeles National Forest, Calif., in lieu of H. R. 13514. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. H3343
3. KERR MEMORIAL. Passed under suspension of the rules H. R. 15822, to authorize this Department to establish the Robert S. Kerr Memorial Arboretum and Nature Center in the Ouachita National Forest, Okla. pp. H3357-62
4. LANDS. Passed as reported H. R. 9098, to revise the boundaries of the Badlands National Monument, S. Dak., and to authorize exchanges of certain lands including forest lands. pp. H3346-8
5. VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION. Passed, 335-0, under suspension of the rules H. R. 16819, to extend the authorization under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act for grants to States for rehabilitation services, to broaden the scope of the goods and services available for the handicapped, etc. pp. H3369-82
6. HOLIDAYS. Rep. McClory inserted the results of opinion polls on H. R. 15951, to provide for certain holidays to be observed on Mondays, and inserted a report on holiday traffic fatalities. pp. H3386-9
7. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported (on May 3 during adjournment) H. R. 17023, the independent offices and HUD appropriation bill (H. Rept. 1348). p. H3397

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1969

MAY 3, 1968.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H.R. 17023]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

The bill is based on budget estimates contained in the 1969 Budget in sections for the Executive Office of the President (pp. 54 to 60), Funds Appropriated to the President (pp. 69 to 71), General Services Administration (pp. 845 to 872), National Aeronautics and Space Administration (pp. 873 to 879), Veterans Administration (pp. 881 to 913), Other Independent Agencies (pp. 918 to 993), and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (pp. 509 to 566).

The 1969 Budget embraces new budget concepts contained in the report of the President's Commission on Budget Concepts. This report also reflects the new budget concept and presents the effects of the Committee's recommendations in terms of new budget (obligational) authority. This includes appropriations, authorizations to spend public debt receipts, and contract authorizations, less appropriations to liquidate contract authorizations.

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

The Committee considered budget estimates for new budget (obligational) authority totaling \$16,570,580,300 for twenty independent executive agencies, commissions, and offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The Committee recommends appropriations which total \$13,670,636,000. This is \$4,290,683,650 below the total for the current fiscal year (counting certain amounts enacted for 1968, but for which action with respect to 1969 has been deferred

for lack of legislative authorization), and \$2,899,944,300 less than the amounts contained in the budget. The overall reductions represent a saving of 17.5% from the amounts proposed in the budget estimates.

The Committee recognizes that the Congress is confronted with some difficult problems and choices. The need for full support for our forces in Vietnam, the solutions to the problems in our cities, and vital domestic programs are all essential. The Nation also is confronted with a serious budget deficit and monetary crisis both at home and abroad. These facts have been given due consideration in arriving at the recommendations contained in this bill.

The Committee considered some 91 items of appropriation and limitation. Reductions are recommended in 70 instances. In some cases the entire amounts requested have been denied. In others substantial cuts are recommended. In a few instances the Committee has approved the full amount budgeted. In no instance has a budget estimate been exceeded.

The reductions in new budget (obligational) authority recommended by the Committee are estimated to have the effect of reducing budget outlays (expenditures) for fiscal year 1969 by some \$360,000,000.

The Committee has deferred consideration of 5 programs or parts of programs for which the legislative authorization has not passed the House, but for which appropriations are requested in the budget. These items will be considered when the authorization bill is enacted. These items are for advance funding for Urban renewal programs and Mass transportation grants; Urban information and technical assistance; and increased authorizations for the Model cities program and Urban planning grants. All of these items are in the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The Committee has proceeded with the consideration of several budgeted items even though the authorization bills have not been enacted. The authorization for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has not been finalized, but has passed the House and the Committee felt that the Congress should proceed. The other authorization relates to civil defense, which has also passed the House.

The following table summarizes the agency, commission, and department budget estimates and the amounts recommended.

Summary of estimates and new budget (obligational) authority

Agency or item	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with budget estimates
National Aeronautics and Space Council-----	\$524, 000	\$500, 000	— \$24, 000
Office of Emergency Planning-----	10, 164, 000	9, 625, 000	— 539, 000
Office of Science and Technology-----	2, 485, 000	1, 750, 000	— 735, 000
Appalachian regional development programs-----	213, 600, 000	168, 600, 000	— 45, 000, 000
Disaster relief-----	15, 000, 000	5, 000, 000	— 10, 000, 000
Appalachian Regional Commission-----	879, 000	850, 000	— 29, 000
Civil Aeronautics Board-----	9, 700, 000	9, 350, 000	— 350, 000
Civil Service Commission-----	153, 455, 000	151, 098, 000	— 2, 357, 000
Federal Communications Commission-----	21, 271, 000	19, 750, 000	— 1, 521, 000
Federal Home Loan Bank Board-----	¹ (19, 484, 000)	¹ (19, 396, 000)	¹ (— 88, 000)
Federal Power Commission-----	16, 060, 000	15, 000, 000	— 1, 060, 000
Federal Trade Commission-----	16, 127, 000	16, 000, 000	— 127, 000
General Services Administration-----	509, 291, 300	494, 813, 000	— 14, 478, 300
Interstate Commerce Commission-----	23, 995, 000	23, 846, 000	— 149, 000
National Aeronautics and Space Administration-----	4, 370, 400, 000	4, 008, 223, 000	— 362, 177, 000
National Science Foundation-----	500, 000, 000	400, 000, 000	— 100, 000, 000
Renegotiation Board-----	3, 080, 000	3, 000, 000	— 80, 000
Securities and Exchange Commission-----	17, 903, 000	17, 730, 000	— 173, 000
Selective Service System-----	63, 568, 000	63, 568, 000	-----
Veterans Administration-----	7, 528, 480, 000	6, 974, 207, 000	— 554, 273, 000
Civil Defense (DOD)-----	76, 800, 000	58, 040, 000	— 18, 760, 000
Civil Defense (HEW)-----	2, 400, 000	-----	— 2, 400, 000
Department of Housing and Urban Development-----	3, 015, 398, 000	1, 229, 686, 000	— 1, 785, 712, 000
Total-----	16, 570, 580, 300	13, 670, 636, 000	— 2, 899, 944, 300

¹ Corporate funds available for administrative and nonadministrative expenses—no appropriation required.

In an overall consideration of the several agencies, commissions, offices and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Committee is recommending a cut of \$2,899,944,300 from the amounts recommended in the President's 1969 Budget.

The amount in the accompanying bill is \$4,290,683,650 below the amount provided for the current fiscal year. This hold-the-line bill provides for substantial reductions in personnel but with allowances in most instances for pay act increases authorized by Congress.

These reductions include \$789,944,300 in new appropriations recommended and \$2,110,000,000 in new funding to be provided through the

sale of participation certificates—a total cut and reduction of \$2,899,944,300 under the budget.

PARTICIPATION CERTIFICATE SALES

The Committee has reviewed carefully the programs for which participation sales authorizations are proposed and recommends that no additional authorizations be provided in fiscal year 1969. This is a net reduction in new budget (obligational) authority of \$2,085,000,000, including \$515,000,000 for the Veterans Administration and \$1,570,000,000 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

In examining the budget programs to see how the funds derived from participation sales would be used, the Committee found only one instance, the Housing for the Elderly or Handicapped Fund, where any of the new budget authority would be required for fiscal year 1969 programs. In this instance the Committee recommends an appropriation of \$25,000,000 instead of the sale of participation certificates.

Prior to 1968 participation certificate sales were not included within the public debt limitation. The participation certificates are included in the 1969 Budget as new obligational authority. As the Congress is empowered to set the limit on the sale of such certificates in appropriation bills, the denial of the authority proposed in the budget this year constitutes a valid reduction in the President's new (obligational) authority requests.

The reductions in participation sales will not affect fiscal year 1969 expenditures, but will effect substantial reductions in spending in future years.

FEES AND CHARGES

Title V of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952 (5 U.S.C. 140) includes a provision providing for the collection of fees by the Federal government for services rendered. It authorizes each agency head to prescribe a fee or charge for benefits, privileges, authority, use, and other things of value which is determined to be "fair and equitable taking into consideration direct and indirect cost to the Government, value to the recipient, public policy or interest served. . . .".

A number of agencies provided for in this bill collect fees or charges for licenses or services rendered. The Committee is concerned that the Federal government is not receiving sufficient return for all the services which it renders to special beneficiaries. This is particularly noteworthy with respect to the value to the recipient of certificates, franchises and operating permits. For instance, the license fees paid in the multibillion dollar radio and television industry are negligible in comparison to the value of these franchises. Other operating rights granted by agencies and commissions of Government have substantial values to the recipients. Accordingly, the Committee recommends that the applicable agencies review their schedule of fees and charges with a view to making increases or adjustments as may be warranted, taking into consideration beneficial certificates and privileges granted, to offset in part the increasing needs for direct appropriations for operating costs of the agencies concerned.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL

The Committee considered a budget request of \$524,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Council, and recommends an appropriation of \$500,000. This is \$24,000 below the budget estimate and the funding level of the current fiscal year. The Council is headed by the Vice President, and it serves in an advisory capacity to assist the President in matters relating to aeronautical and space programs. The sum recommended should be adequate to enable the Council to carry out essential functions.

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING

The primary responsibility of this Office is to direct non-military emergency preparedness activities of the United States under a delegation of authority from the President. The budget proposes \$10,164,000 for this Office in three items of appropriation, \$5,043,000 for salaries and expenses, \$1,986,000 for telecommunications activities, and \$3,135,000 for civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies.

An appropriation of \$4,850,000 is recommended for salaries and expenses, which maintains the same level of funding as in the current year with an adjustment for pay act costs.

An appropriation of \$1,675,000 is included for the conduct of telecommunications functions, of which \$500,000 is for telecommunications research.

For civil defense and defense mobilization functions performed by Federal agencies under delegations of authority from the President, the Committee is recommending \$3,100,000, which will be allocated to eight departments and agencies to assist in carrying out national emergency preparedness responsibilities delegated to them, which they would not normally be expected to perform without a specific delegation of responsibility. The amount provided is \$35,000 less than the budget estimate. The Committee recommends further consolidation of civil defense and emergency preparedness in an effort to effect economy and efficiency.

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

The Office of Science and Technology is headed by Dr. Donald F. Hornig, who is the Science Adviser to the President. The budget estimate for the salaries and expenses of this Office is \$1,985,000, and the Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,750,000. This is a reduction of \$235,000 below the budget, but an increase of \$200,000 over 1968. The amount provided should enable this Office to more adequately assess total research and development activities. The annual national investment in research and development is currently \$23,000,000,000, of which \$17,000,000,000 is financed by the Federal government.

A request for \$500,000 was included in the budget to initiate a national energy study at the direction of the President. The basic purpose of such a study would be to appraise Government policies and programs for all forms of energy—coal, oil, gas, hydro-electric, and nuclear—which are becoming progressively interchangeable and competitive.

The Committee recognizes that the Government must be assured that its energy policies are rational and reasonably consistent. Qualified experts on the staff of the Office of Science and Technology and in various departments and agencies of the Government should seek the cooperation of industry to bring together information currently available, and perhaps achieve most of the goals of the study at substantial savings. Accordingly, funds for this study are denied by the Committee at this time.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

The program for Appalachia is a joint Federal-State effort to arrive at common solutions to regional problems that are beyond the capacities of the States to solve themselves. The initiative for making proposals is with the State governments, and the assistance provided by the Federal government is intended to supplement existing programs. The beneficial results expected to come from the Appalachian programs are beginning to show in the highway and access roads program, and the programs of trade schools, hospitals and health centers are proving to be effective aids in other critical areas of need.

The budget estimate for programs authorized by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended, is \$213,600,000. The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$168,600,000 which is \$45,000,000 below the budget estimate. This is the first year the entire program is funded in this bill. Funds for the highway program have previously been provided in another bill.

The Appalachian Regional Development Act embraces 13 States, 397 counties, and nearly one-tenth of the population of the Nation, with an average annual income that is estimated to be 24 percent below the national average.

One of the greatest problems of the region is inadequate access and the need for transportation within the area. This has long been an impediment to development throughout the region. The basic act authorized 2,700 miles of development highways and 1,000 miles of local access roads to open up the area to help increase the economy. Testimony indicates that only 58 miles of roads have been built to date. Planning and site acquisition has been underway for several years. Contracts are currently being awarded. Some States have provided advance funding for which reimbursements must be made. Testimony at the time of the hearing indicated a need for \$100,000,000 over the budget. The Committee is now advised that the requirement is \$155,500,000 in excess of the budget amount.

The Committee has made a reduction in the highway program of \$25,000,000 below the budget and feels the amount recommended is reasonable at this time in view of overall budget considerations.

The budget proposes \$879,000 in a separate item of appropriation for administrative expenses of the Commission. The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$850,000, which is \$29,000 below the budget estimate. The several Appalachian States provide matching funds in equal amounts for administrative expenses of the Commission.

DISASTER RELIEF

The budget request is \$15,000,000 for assistance to State and local governments in the event of a declared major disaster. The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$5,000,000 which is \$10,000,000 less than the amount requested. The present balance in the fund was \$19,252,257 on March 25, 1968. The total available should be sufficient under normal circumstances. However, in the event of unusual disasters a supplemental appropriation may be required.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Substantial progress has been made by the Civil Aeronautics Board in cooperation with the carriers to provide essential air service to some 500 smaller communities in the United States, to develop a viable industry, and to steadily reduce the subsidy payments that are required.

The budget proposes \$9,700,000 for salaries and expenses of the Board and the Committee recommends \$9,350,000. This is a reduction of \$350,000 below the budget request and an increase of \$367,000 over 1968. Most of the increase allowed is for the cost of the pay raise made effective last year by the Congress.

An appropriation of \$45,000,000 is proposed to liquidate contract authorization for airline subsidy payments instead of the \$47,600,000 included in the budget. The estimated subsidy accrual for fiscal year 1969 is \$28,000,000 below the peak year of 1963 and is the lowest in the last 10 years. Only two of the six carrier groups eligible for subsidy currently receive payments. These are the local service and Alaska carriers. The Committee expects this commendable progress in reduction in subsidy payments to continue in 1969.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The budget for all items of appropriation for this Commission totals \$159,915,000 for 1969. The Committee recommends \$157,558,000, including \$151,098,000 by appropriation and \$6,460,000 by transfer from trust funds. This, is \$2,410,000 more than the appropriation total for 1968, and \$2,357,000 less than the budget estimates for 1969.

For salaries and expenses of the Commission the bill provides \$37,000,000 by appropriation and \$6,460,000 by transfer from the retirement, health, and insurance trust funds, or a total of \$43,460,000. This is \$2,309,000 less than the budgeted amount.

Last year the Committee expressed its displeasure with a proposal of the Commission to finance the cost of its interagency board program by reimbursements and charges to agencies and departments instead of by direct appropriation. The Committee recognizes the merits of the program, but is of the opinion that the centralized activities should cost less, not more, than the agency boards replaced. The boards are now funded by direct appropriations. The Committee notes that a number of other activities promoted by the Commission are being financed by charges and reimbursements from agencies and departments. Section 307 of the bill specifically prohibits the use of funds for certain interdepartmental boards, commissions, councils, committees, or similar groups which do not have prior and specific Congressional approval.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,350,000 for payment of annuities to widows of employees of the Lighthouse Service and to employees and survivors of persons employed in the construction of the Panama Canal. An appropriation of \$40,748,000

is also provided for the Government's share of the cost of health benefits programs for retired employees.

The \$72,000,000 contained in the budget for payment to the Civil service retirement and disability fund is recommended to cover the cost during 1969 of increased benefits to certain retired employees. This sum is required by law for benefit payments. The Committee again calls attention to the fact that the deficit in the Civil service retirement and disability fund continues to increase. The deficiency is estimated at \$51,708,022,000 at June 30, 1968, and the fund will be paying out more than it is taking in by 1974. A subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee has held hearings relative to this matter and action should be taken to provide for better financing to insure the soundness of the fund.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The budget proposes an appropriation of \$21,271,000 for salaries and expenses of the Federal Communications Commission. The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$19,750,000, which is \$1,521,000 less than the budget estimate. The \$650,000 increase provided is required to cover increased pay and other mandatory costs.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

The Committee recommends a limitation of \$5,000,000 for the administrative expenses of the Board, a limitation of \$14,396,000 for examining and supervising member institutions, and a limitation of \$340,000 for administrative expenses of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, or a total limitation of \$19,736,000 for all administrative expenses. The Committee recommends a reduction of \$88,000 in administrative expenses for the Board.

The Committee recognizes the significance of the Board's activities as it relates to the welfare of the Federal Home Loan Bank System, particularly in today's financial market. Recent legislation has strengthened the capability of the Board to deal with problem areas. The Committee continues to urge timely precautionary and remedial action with problem associations whenever appropriate.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

The budget estimate for salaries and expenses of this Commission is \$16,060,000, and the Committee recommends an appropriation of \$15,000,000, which is \$1,060,000 less than the amount requested. The Committee is of the opinion that the proposed natural gas survey, although desirable, can be deferred at this time.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

The budget estimate for this Commission is \$16,127,000. This includes \$7,883,000 for anti-monopoly work, \$6,902,000 for deceptive practices activities, and \$1,342,000 for administration and executive direction. The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$16,000,000, which is \$127,000 below the budget request. The increase over 1968 is to provide for pay and other increased expenses of the Commission.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

The Committee considered budget estimates totaling \$509,291,300 for the General Services Administration and recommends appropriations in the amount of \$494,813,000. This reflects a total reduction of \$64,671,900 below the level of funding provided for the current fiscal year and \$14,478,300 less than the budget. No funds are provided for new public buildings construction projects for 1969.

Real property items.—The budget estimate for operating expenses of the Public Buildings Service is \$278,763,000 and the Committee has approved \$271,881,000 for this purpose. This maintains the funding level of the current fiscal year after allowing for expected transfers and increased pay costs. The amount is \$6,882,000 less than the budget estimate and will require the practice of strict economy.

The Committee is recommending the full budget estimate of \$80,000,000 for repair and improvement of Federally-owned buildings. This is the same level of funding as in the current fiscal year. The backlog of maintenance repairs and modernization projects at the end of fiscal year 1969 is estimated at \$448,100,000. The Committee is of the opinion that the amount recommended in the bill is a minimum that should be provided to protect the capital investment in Federally-owned buildings.

No new public buildings construction projects are included in the budget for the General Services Administration consistent with current fiscal policy to minimize and defer commitments and expenditures wherever possible. The Committee has approved the budget estimate of \$10,995,000 for sites and planning for 7 projects and increases for 4 others where revised prospectuses and plans require additional funding. This will permit the GSA to continue planning for projects on a minimal basis until there is an easing of the current fiscal situation.

The bill contains the budget estimate of \$2,400,000 for payment of taxes and amortization on lease-purchase contracts for buildings constructed in previous years under the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954.

The sum of \$750,000 is recommended for furniture and furnishings and facilities for United States Courts. This is \$450,000 below the budget estimate and \$250,000 below the funding level of 1968. The Committee is of the opinion that this should provide adequately for the essential requirements of the courts.

Federal Supply Service.—The Federal Supply Service manages all personal property activities of the General Services Administration, including the operation of its stores and worldwide supply system. The budget estimate for such activities is \$76,534,000, and the Committee recommends \$72,500,000. This is \$4,034,000 below the amount requested. The increase is \$719,000 over a comparable 1968 level. Procurement volume through the supply system continues to rise and is projected at \$1,835,000,000 in 1969, an increase of \$61,000,000 over 1968. This will require greater economy and efficiency to handle the increased volume. Substantial increased procurement and sales activity is made necessary by the Vietnam conflict.

National Archives and Records Service.—The National Archives and Records Service manages the Government's archives and records system and operates the Presidential libraries. The budget estimate for these activities is \$18,728,300 and the Committee recommends

an appropriation of \$18,300,000. The amount recommended is \$428,300 less than the budget estimate. The \$720,000 increase provided is to cover pay raise costs, expanded requirements of Presidential libraries, and other related and uncontrollable requirements anticipated in the next fiscal year.

Transportation and Communications Service.—The Committee considered a budget request of \$6,510,000 for the Transportation and Communications Service and recommends an appropriation of \$6,150,000. This reflects a reduction of \$360,000 from the budget estimate and provides an increase of \$270,000 over the amount available for the current fiscal year. The increase allowed over 1968 is for increased pay costs provided by the Congress.

Property Management and Disposal Service.—The budget includes \$30,500,000 for activities relating to the stockpiling of strategic and critical materials, and the utilization and disposal of surplus personal property. The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$28,500,000, which is \$2,000,000 less than the budget estimate. The Committee is of the opinion that the request to purchase the land which contains GSA warehouses and a tank farm at Hammond, Indiana, should receive further study to determine the long-term needs of the Government.

The language as requested in the budget to clarify present authority to use excess materials in stockpile inventories as payment in lieu of cash for acquiring and upgrading materials contained in the Defense Production Act inventory is included in the bill.

General items.—An appropriation of \$1,820,000 is included in the bill for the Office of the Administrator. This is an increase of \$73,000 over the current year to provide for increased pay act costs. The Committee is not recommending the \$123,000 requested for several deputy regional administrators at this time.

The bill includes \$267,000 for allowances and office facilities for former Presidents and widows of Presidents of the United States as proposed in the budget.

Public Law 87-277 requires Congress every four years to provide a sum for Presidential transition expenses to be appropriated to the General Services Administration. In accordance with this statutory requirement, a sum of \$900,000 is recommended as proposed in the budget estimate, which if unused will revert to the Treasury.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The budget estimate is \$23,995,000 for salaries and expenses of this Commission. The Committee recommends \$23,846,000 which is \$149,000 less than the budget estimate.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has important regulatory functions in rail, water and surface transportation in the public interest. The Committee is pleased to note that the Commission is becoming more responsive to the needs of the general public in directing improvements in service and the Commission is commended and encouraged to take further action in this direction.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

The Committee considered budget estimates totaling \$4,370,400,-000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and

recommends a total of \$4,008,223,000 for 1969. This is a reduction of \$362,177,000 below the budget request and is \$580,677,000 less than appropriations for similar purposes in fiscal year 1968. It is \$959,777,000 below the appropriations provided in fiscal year 1967.

Our national space program has come a long way during the first decade of the space age. We have launched more vehicles, have traveled more miles, and have achieved more time in space than any other nation in the world.

The Nation's achievements in space are outstanding and the Administrator, the astronauts and the team of the National space program are to be commended. The Nation is proud of our national effort in space exploration.

The Committee recognizes the current budgetary situation with increased costs of the Vietnam conflict and domestic demands, and accordingly, of necessity, has reduced the program levels in all new appropriations for 1969. The funding provided will afford a balanced space program to carry out national policy goals and objectives while considering other financial requirements of the country. It should be pointed out that overall space expenditures for NASA have been reduced from about a \$6,000,000,000 level in recent years, to a \$4,000,000,000 obligational level in the current fiscal year as herein recommended.

Research and Development.—The budget proposes \$3,677,200,000 for research and development activities in 1969. The Committee recommends \$3,383,250,000, which is reduction of \$293,950,000 below the budget and \$541,750,000 less than the amount provided in fiscal year 1968. The Committee takes cognizance of the fact that the momentum of the Apollo program has been reestablished following a number of delays and setbacks. The Committee recommends that only the most important and highest priority programs be funded at this time.

Construction of Facilities.—The budget estimate for the construction and modification of NASA's facilities is \$45,000,000. The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$21,800,000. This is \$23,200,000 less than the budget estimate. The funds recommended will provide for strengthening launch pads, needed utility modifications and communications services. The proposed new laboratory addition for flight crew training at Houston, the seawall extension at Wallops Island, and the power plant addition at Fairbanks, Alaska, have been deferred at this time.

Administrative Operations.—The Committee considered a budget estimate of \$648,200,000 for administrative operations and recommends an appropriation of \$603,173,000, a reduction of \$45,027,000. The Committee considers it important that our space team of scientists, engineers, astronauts, and technicians—the finest in the world—be retained to the greatest extent possible, but is of the opinion that some reduction in staff is warranted since funding of program levels are being reduced and since a number of major projects and missions are being completed.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Committee considered a budget request of \$500,000,000 for the National Science Foundation and recommends an appropriation of \$400,000,000. This is \$100,000,000 below the budget estimate and \$95,000,000 below the appropriation for the present fiscal year.

Testimony before the Committee disclosed that funding provided to the Foundation has built up an unobligated carryover balance of \$46,500,000, and a substantially larger obligated but unexpended balance of over \$600,000,000 is estimated to be carried forward into 1969. The Committee recognizes the competence of the Director and Members of the National Science Board and recommends that they make the necessary contractual adjustments in the institutional and fellowship grant programs to effectuate the economies proposed. The Committee recognizes the necessity of this action because of the current budgetary situation, while appreciating the importance of the work and the long range beneficial effects to the Nation of the programs of the National Science Foundation.

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

The budget proposes an appropriation of \$3,080,000 for fiscal year 1969, which compares with an appropriation of \$2,600,000 for the current year and an additional \$76,000 that is anticipated to cover the cost of the recent pay act. The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$3,000,000, which will provide an increase of \$324,000 over the 1968 level and \$80,000 less than the budget estimate. Since the Board's inception, the determinations of excessive profits have totaled \$952,000,000, and voluntary refunds and voluntary price reductions have totaled \$1,300,000,000—a total of \$2,252,000,000 effected by the Renegotiation Board. The Committee is of the opinion that the increase recommended is needed to handle an expanding workload generated by the Vietnam conflict.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The budget estimate for this Commission is \$17,903,000. The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$17,730,000, which is \$173,000 below the budget estimate. This is the same amount as provided in 1968, including adjustments for mandatory pay act costs.

In recent years there has been a startling growth in the sales volume of securities traded on and off the stock exchanges. The Commission's workload continues to increase and the Committee is fully aware of the complex problems with which this Commission is confronted. The Committee urges the Commission to continue to be diligent in the discharge of its mission.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

The Committee recommends the budget request of \$63,568,000 for the Selective Service System. The appropriation for the current fiscal year is \$57,455,000 and an estimate is pending in a supplemental request for an additional \$6,720,000, bringing the total to \$64,175,000 for the fiscal year of 1968.

The latest figure of the number of registrants to be inducted in the armed services in the current fiscal year is 355,000, and the 1969 budget is predicated on an induction of 240,000 selectees.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

The total budget request for the Veterans Administration for 1969 is \$7,013,480,000, excluding the proposed sale of \$515,000,000 of participation certificates. The participation certificate sales have been denied as not needed for veterans programs as previously discussed. The requested funds for the Veterans Administration programs is \$364,201,000 over 1968. This increase is made necessary because of the increasing number of veterans being discharged monthly and increasing benefits authorized by the Congress. The Committee has made only nominal reductions from the total request and is recommending appropriations totaling \$6,974,207,000.

The funds recommended in the bill reflect the continuing interest and concern of our Nation to provide an effective and comprehensive veteran benefits program. On June 30, 1967, there were approximately 25.8 million veterans and 66.5 million family members and survivors of living veterans who are potentially eligible for veterans benefits. The number of veterans will increase by an estimated 517,000 in the fiscal year 1969.

Nearly \$5,300,000,000, or over 75% of the total appropriations for the Veterans Administration is to finance benefits programs. Another \$1,484,727,000, or approximately 21%, is requested for medical programs representing an increase of \$62,100,000 over 1968 levels. The amount of \$198,549,000, or only about 3%, is proposed for administrative or general operating expenses.

The Committee has approved the budget request of \$4,654,336,000 for payment of Compensation and pensions to veterans and their dependents. This represents the largest item in the bill. An appropriation of \$612,000,000 is provided for Readjustment benefits, and \$9,350,000 is included for other benefit programs.

The budget request of \$1,420,264,000 for hospital and medical care is approved. Medical and prosthetic research is continued at the current level. An appropriation of \$14,200,000 is recommended for Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses and \$1,776,000 is provided for Grants to the Republic of the Philippines.

The Committee has deferred funding the request for an appropriation of \$25,412,000 for the construction of a new 760 bed VA hospital at San Antonio, Texas, at this time.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

CIVIL DEFENSE

The budget requested \$77,300,000 for Civil Defense in 1969. The Committee recommends \$58,540,000 for this program at this time, including a transfer of \$500,000 from the Civil Defense Procurement Fund. This is a reduction of \$18,760,000 below the budget.

For Operation and maintenance of Civil Defense the budget estimate is \$55,700,000. This is \$10,400,000 less than the current fiscal year and the Committee is recommending a further reduction of \$7,160,000. The amount recommended by the Committee for grants to States and local civil defense organizations in support of personnel and administrative expenses is continued at the 1968 level of \$18,500,000.

The budget recommends \$21,600,000 for Research, shelter surveys and marking. An appropriation of \$10,000,000 is recommended for this purpose, which is a reduction of \$11,600,000 below the budget estimate and \$10,000,000 less than the 1968 appropriation.

Civil Defense Director Joseph Romm is a talented administrator and has been able to effectuate efficiency and economy in administering the vast civil defense programs.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Committee has denied the \$2,400,000 requested for the medical stockpile and emergency health training and preparedness functions. Testimony disclosed that the Public Health Service has an unobligated balance of \$7,574,000 of prior year funds that will be carried over into 1969. The unobligated balance should be adequate to maintain and continue such activities during the next fiscal year.

For the past several years the Committee has been urging the consolidation of warehousing activities to reduce costs and effect economies. Several consolidations have been made, and large portions of the medical stockpile supplies have been moved to the shelves of community hospitals. Here they are readily available for use in the event of an emergency, and serve a multiple purpose in that they provide hospitals with reserve inventories. Such stocks are rotated continually as they are used and replaced. The Committee recommends continued steps in this direction.

The Committee further recommends that the proposed consolidation of the depots at Neosho, Missouri, and Dixon, Illinois, be deferred at this time for further evaluation. It may be possible to achieve even greater and further savings at a later date with the continuing draw-down and utilization of supplies as they are relocated at community hospitals.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

The Committee considered budget estimates totaling \$3,015,398,000 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development at this time. An additional \$2,001,162,000 requested by the President has been deferred for lack of legislative authorization, but will be considered when such authorization is provided.

The Committee recommends appropriations totaling \$1,229,686,000 for programs of this Department. The overall reduction of \$1,785,712,000 includes deferral of the sale of \$1,595,000,000 of participation certificates, since the new obligational authority to be provided from such sales is not considered needed for funding of programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development in 1969. The \$25,000,000 requested for the Housing for the elderly or handicapped fund, which was proposed to be funded through the sale of participation certificates has been approved, and is provided by direct appropriation.

The appropriations recommended are only a partial indication of the size of the total program the Department administers. Some of the most substantial programs in terms of budget obligations and expenditures are financed in corporate and trust fund accounts.

The President, in his message to the Congress on the cities, has pointed out that the Federal government is making financial commitments of more than \$22,000,000,000 to the problems of the cities through more than 100 programs. The Special Analysis to the Budget states that "the Department of Housing and Urban Development estimates that the total Federal financial commitment for urban, social and community development aids could be considered to exceed \$37,000,000,000 in 1969—more than twice the level in 1961." The amount in this bill is therefore only a small indication of the total Federal commitment to ongoing programs for cities and urban development.

RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE

The programs designed to attack urban blight, inadequate housing and the related social problems of our cities have been brought together under the Assistant Secretary for Renewal and Housing Assistance. His responsibilities include programs for housing for the elderly and handicapped, college housing, Alaska housing, and others.

Housing for the elderly or handicapped fund.—As set forth above, the budget proposed new budget (obligational) authority of \$25,000,000 through the sale of participation certificates for Housing for the elderly or handicapped. The Committee is recommending an appropriation of \$25,000,000 instead of the sale of participation certificates to finance this program.

College housing loans.—In the College housing loan program there are funds in excess of \$2,000,000,000 available for college housing loans. An administrative expense limitation of \$2,275,000 is recommended for 1969.

Alaska housing.—The Committee recommends the budget estimate of \$1,000,000 to assist in financing housing and related facilities for natives and other low-income residents in Alaska. An authorization of \$10,000,000 has been provided for this program. A request for an initial appropriation was disallowed last year pending refinement of program standards and evidence that the State of Alaska would provide required matching fund commitments. The Committee is of the opinion the program should now proceed as the State of Alaska has made available its share in this participating program.

Grants for neighborhood facilities.—The budget estimate for making grants to local public bodies and agencies to assist in financing the cost of providing neighborhood facilities is \$40,000,000. The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$35,000,000, which is a reduction of \$5,000,000 below the budget. These funds generally provide for two-thirds of the cost of construction of neighborhood facilities, primarily in congested areas. The other one-third contribution is made by the local governments.

Low-rent public housing annual contributions.—There are over 2,100 public housing authorities in 50 States throughout the Nation providing more than 712,000 low-rent public housing units on June 30, 1968. An additional 75,000 units will be completed in 1969. The budget request for annual contribution payments is estimated at \$358,000,000 for 1969. The Committee recommends \$350,000,000, or \$8,000,000 less than the budget. The \$75,000,000 increase over 1968 is made necessary by the increasing number of low-rent public housing units becoming available and contractual commitments for which payments are required.

METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT

The programs administered by the Assistant Secretary for Metropolitan Development provide assistance to States and local governments, cities, groups of towns and communities in metropolitan areas, and small communities. The programs of this division are concerned with the development of town planning, public facility loans and grants, transportation assistance and related community services. The 1969 budget proposed \$458,700,000 for Metropolitan Development. The amounts recommended in these programs are as set forth below.

Urban planning grants.—The budget proposes an appropriation of \$55,000,000 for grants to states, cities, smaller communities, and regional planning agencies to help finance surveys and planning as authorized by Section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended. The \$38,838,000 recommended is the maximum amount that can be provided at this time, as this sum represents the total present unfunded authorization for Urban planning grants.

Open space land programs.—The budget includes \$85,000,000 for open space land grants and the Committee recommends an appropriation of \$75,000,000 for this purpose, a reduction of \$10,000,000.

This program provides matching grants to assist public bodies to finance acquisition of land in urban areas for park, recreation, conservation, historic, or other purposes. The amount provided continues funding for 1969 at the 1968 level.

Grants for basic water and sewer facilities.—The Committee recommends the budget estimate of \$150,000,000 to aid communities in building water and sewer facilities to promote their efficient and orderly growth and development. This is \$15,000,000 less than the 1968 appropriation, and is necessitated by the current budget situation. This program provides grants of up to 50 percent of the cost of building and improving water and sewer facilities to meet current and future growth demands of communities and metropolitan areas. The established need and demands for this program far exceed the budgeted amount provided.

Urban mass transportation grants.—The budget proposed an appropriation of \$15,000,000 for Urban mass transportation grants for 1969 and advance funding of \$230,000,000 for 1970. The recent reorganization plan for transportation provides that planning for urban transportation shall be conducted by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, whereas the mass transportation grant program shall be administered by the Department of Transportation.

The Congress has previously provided an appropriation of \$175,000,000 for 1969 for mass transportation grants. In view of the pending reorganization, the funds previously provided for this purpose, and the lack of new authorization, the Committee has deferred the advance funding for this program at this time.

DEMONSTRATIONS AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

The Assistant Secretary for Demonstrations and Intergovernmental Relations is primarily responsible for administering the Model cities program, and others that are directed toward encouraging State and local governments to raise their capabilities in dealing with varied municipal problems.

Model cities programs.—The President recommended in the budget an appropriation of \$1,000,000,000 for the Model cities program, which seeks to improve the quality of urban life through a concerted effort on blighted neighborhoods. This amount includes \$500,000,000 for supplementary grants, and another \$500,000,000 for urban renewal projects in model cities areas. The maximum unfunded authorization for the Model cities program at this time is \$650,000,000. The Committee recommends \$500,000,000 for this purpose at this time.

By way of breakdown, the Committee recommends \$200,000,000 for the initial cities, \$200,000,000 for the second round of model cities soon to be announced, and \$100,000,000 for urban renewal

projects in model cities areas, or a total of \$500,000,000 for 1969. This is \$150,000,000 less than the budget estimate considered, and \$188,000,000 above the funding level of 1968. The Committee believes that these amounts should adequately fund the program in its initial stage. The one-half billion dollars in new funds recommended for this program represents more than 75 percent of the authorized amount for the Model cities program at this time.

Urban Research and Technology.—The budget requested \$20,000,000 for Urban research and technology. The Committee recommends \$10,000,000, a reduction of \$10,000,000 below the budget.

MORTGAGE CREDIT

The activities in this section of the Department relate primarily to three functions, insuring operations under the Federal Housing Administration, administration of the Rent supplement program, and provision for a secondary market service for home mortgages through the Federal National Mortgage Association.

Federal Housing Administration.—A limitation of \$11,500,000 is recommended for administrative expenses and \$92,000,000 is provided for nonadministrative expenses related to processing workloads of mortgage insurance applications. This provides a total increase of \$5,500,000 for administrative and nonadministrative expenses over the current year and reflects a reduction of \$4,050,000 in the budget requests. The FHA workload for 1969 is expected to increase considerably. Applications for mortgage insurance are expected to reach 1,201,000, or about 20 percent over the estimated number for 1968.

The Committee urges that contract fee appraisers be used to a greater extent to handle peak workloads instead of increasing the staff of the FHA. This should result in substantial long-term savings in the opinion of the Committee.

Rent supplement program.—The budget recommends \$65,000,000 in new contract authorization for the Rent supplement program in 1969. The Committee has approved and recommends \$25,000,000, for this program at this time. This represents a cut of \$40,000,000 from the budget proposal.

In view of the evident need for substantial numbers of low-income housing, the Secretary is urged to utilize the several approaches authorized by Congress, including the rent supplement program, low-rent public housing, the rent certificate and leasing programs, and other approaches presently authorized and available. The utilization of all these programs should provide increased numbers of needed housing units throughout the Nation.

The bill also provides an appropriation of \$12,000,000 for payments on rent supplement units in 1969, which is \$3,000,000 less than the budget estimate. An appropriation of \$1,350,000 is included in the

bill for administrative expenses. The Committee is of the opinion the amounts provided will meet the current needs of this program.

Federal National Mortgage Association.—The Committee recommends a limitation of \$10,000,000 for administrative expenses of the Association, which is \$340,000 less than the budget estimate. The FNMA will provide support for accelerated housing programs in 1969.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

The Committee considered budget estimates for appropriations and administrative and nonadministrative expense limitations for salaries and expenses for all activities of the Department of Housing and Urban Development totaling \$206,361,000. The bill includes \$190,439,000 for such administrative and nonadministrative expenses of the Department. This is an increase of \$14,141,000 over the current year, and \$15,922,000 below the total amount requested. Most of the increased amounts are to cover increased pay act costs, and the full annual cost of salaries and other expenses for recent staff additions to administer new and expanded programs approved by the Congress. The amounts recommended are set forth in the following table.

Administrative and Nonadministrative Expenses for the Department of Housing and Urban Development

	Availability, 1968 ¹	Budget esti- mate, 1969	Recom- mended in bill	Reduction below budget estimate
RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE				
Salaries and expenses.....	\$32,493,000	\$36,360,000	\$34,000,000	—\$2,360,000
Housing for the elderly or handicapped.....	1,272,000	1,282,000	1,272,000	—10,000
College housing loans.....	2,275,000	1,285,000	2,275,000	—10,000
Total.....	36,040,000	39,927,000	37,547,000	—2,380,000
METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT				
Salaries and expenses.....	6,226,000	8,700,000	7,000,000	—1,700,000
Public facility loans.....	1,227,000	1,235,000	1,227,000	—8,000
Revolving fund (liquidating programs).....	100,000	104,000	100,000	—4,000
Total.....	7,553,000	10,039,000	8,327,000	—1,712,000
DEMONSTRATIONS AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS				
Salaries and expenses.....	1,859,000	1,860,000	1,860,000	-----
Model cities programs.....	2,580,000	8,380,000	6,000,000	—2,380,000
Total.....	4,439,000	10,240,000	7,860,000	—2,380,000
Urban research and technology.....	² 260,000	² 885,000	500,000	—385,000
DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT				
General administration.....	4,107,000	8,000,000	6,000,000	—2,000,000
Regional management.....	5,412,000	8,925,000	6,500,000	—2,425,000
Total.....	9,519,000	16,925,000	12,500,000	—4,425,000
Total, Appropriations and limitations.....	57,811,000	78,016,000	66,734,000	—11,282,000
MORTGAGE CREDIT				
FHA rent supplements.....	1,100,000	1,600,000	1,350,000	—250,000
FHA administrative expenses.....	11,000,000	11,950,000	11,500,000	—450,000
FHA nonadministrative expenses.....	87,000,000	95,600,000	92,000,000	—3,600,000
FNMA administrative expenses.....	9,940,000	10,340,000	10,000,000	—340,000
Total.....	109,040,000	119,490,000	114,850,000	—4,640,000
Reimbursements and working funds (net).....	9,447,000	8,855,000	8,855,000	-----
Grand total administrative and non- administrative expenses.....	176,298,000	206,361,000	190,439,000	—15,922,000

¹ Includes Pay Act supplementals pending or proposed for later transmittal.

² Reimbursable from appropriation without specific limitation.

Working capital fund.—The budget proposes \$2,000,000 increased capital for this fund to capitalize the cost of departmental data processing services. The FHA owns the equipment and its cost has been written down on the books of FHA to a present value of \$287,000, and will be fully depreciated in another year. The Committee has denied the request for funds for this purpose at this time. When the Department feels that it must have a new generation of computers a request for funds may be considered by the Committee and the Congress.

LIMITATIONS AND LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

The following limitations and legislative provisions not heretofore carried in connection with any appropriation bill are recommended.

On page 14, lines 15 and 19, in connection with Operating expenses, Property Management and Disposal Service:

*of acquisition of materials, or, * * *, and of processing and refining materials pursuant to section 303(d) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2093 (d)).*

On page 29, line 13 in connection with Civil Defense:

and in addition, \$500,000 which shall be derived by transfer from Civil Defense Procurement Fund established by the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (50 U.S.C. App. 2264):

On page 34, line 8, in connection with Urban research and technology:

: Provided, That not to exceed \$500,000 of the foregoing amount shall be available for administrative expenses.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1968 AND THE BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR 1969

PERMANENT NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY--FEDERAL FUNDS

[Becomes available automatically under earlier, or "permanent" law without further, or annual, action by the Congress. Thus, these amounts are *not* included in the accompanying bill]

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority, 1968 (2)	Budget estimate of new (obligational) authority, 1969 (3)	Increase (+) or decrease (-) (4)
Civil Aeronautics Board: Payments to air carriers (contract authorization, indefinite)-----	\$53,061,000	\$53,211,000	+\$150,000
Federal Power Commission: Payments to States under Federal Power Act (indefinite)-----	99,000	99,000	-----
General Services Administration: Expenses, disposal of surplus real and related personal property (indefinite)-----	1,000,000	1,000,000	-----
Veterans' Administration: Veterans insurance and indemnities (indefinite)-----	650,000	650,000	-----
Department of Housing and Urban Development:			
<i>Urban renewal programs</i> -----	¹ (750,000,000)	¹ (750,000,000)	-----
College housing loan fund (authorization to spend public debt receipts)-----	300,000,000	300,000,000	-----

College housing loan fund (participation sales insufficiencies, indefinite)-----	10, 739, 000	12, 061, 000	+ 1, 322, 000
<i>Urban mass transportation grants</i> -----	¹ (125, 000, 000)	¹ (175, 000, 000)	¹ (+ 50, 000, 000)
Public facility loans (participation sales insufficiencies, indefinite)-----	1, 325, 000	1, 305, 000	--20, 000
Federal National Mortgage Association:			
Special assistance functions (authorization to spend public debt receipts) -	550, 000, 000	525, 000, 000	--25, 000, 000
Management and liquidating functions (authorization to spend public debt receipts, indefinite)-----	82, 708, 000	-----	--82, 708, 000
Total permanent new budget (obligational) authority, Federal funds----	999, 582, 000	893, 326, 000	--106, 256, 000

¹ New budget (obligational) authority becoming available under prior appropriation acts and excluded from totals.

NOTE.—Amounts as estimated and shown in the January 1968 budget document. Some items are indefinite in amount, and thus are subject to later reestimation.

PERMANENT NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY—TRUST FUNDS

[Becomes available automatically under earlier, or "permanent" law without further, or annual, action by the Congress. Thus, these amounts are *not* included in the accompanying bill]

(1) Agency and item	(2) New budget (obligational) authority, 1968	(3) Budget estimate of new (obligational) authority, 1969	(4) Increase (+) or decrease (—)
Appalachian Regional Commission: Miscellaneous trust fund accounts-----	\$1, 398, 000	\$1, 592, 000	+\$194, 000
Civil Service Commission: Civil service retirement and disability fund-----	3, 440, 100, 000	3, 626, 500, 000	+ 186, 400, 000
General Services Administration: National archives gift fund-----	150, 000	100, 000	— 50, 000
National Aeronautics and Space Administration: Miscellaneous trust funds-----	2, 688, 000	1, 548, 000	— 1, 140, 000
National Science Foundation: Donations-----	1, 000	1, 000	-----
Veterans Administration:			
General post fund, national homes-----	1, 820, 000	1, 790, 000	— 30, 000
National service life insurance fund-----	702, 160, 000	699, 043, 000	— 3, 117, 000
U.S. Government life insurance fund-----	49, 810, 000	44, 725, 000	— 5, 085, 000
Department of Housing and Urban Development: Federal National Mortgage Association, secondary market operations-----	536, 655, 000	159, 000, 000	— 377, 655, 000
Total permanent new budget (obligational) authority, trust funds-----	4, 734, 782, 000	4, 534, 299, 000	— 200, 483, 000

ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

[Limitation on amounts of corporate funds to be expended]

27

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1968, (enacted to date) ¹ (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in the bill (4)	Bill compared with—	
				New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1968, (enacted to date) (5)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969 (6)
<i>Federal Home Loan Bank Board:</i>					
<i>Administrative expenses</i> -----	(\$4, 540, 000)	(\$5, 088, 000)	(\$5, 000, 000)	(+ \$460, 000)	(- \$88, 000)
<i>Nonadministrative expenses</i> -----	(13, 650, 000)	(14, 396, 000)	(14, 396, 000)	(+ 746, 000)	-----
<i>Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation</i> -----	(298, 000)	(340, 000)	(340, 000)	(+ 42, 000)	-----
<i>Department of Housing and Urban Development:</i>					
<i>Housing for the elderly or handicapped</i> ---	(1, 232, 000)	(1, 282, 000)	(1, 272, 000)	(+ 40, 000)	(- 10, 000)
<i>College housing loans</i> -----	(2, 200, 000)	(2, 285, 000)	(2, 275, 000)	(+ 75, 000)	(- 10, 000)
<i>Public facility loans</i> -----	(1, 187, 000)	(1, 235, 000)	(1, 227, 000)	(+ 40, 000)	(- 8, 000)
<i>Revolving fund (liquidating programs)</i> ---	(100, 000)	(104, 000)	(100, 000)	-----	(- 4, 000)
<i>Federal Housing Administration:</i>					
<i>Administrative expenses</i> -----	(11, 000, 000)	(11, 950, 000)	(11, 500, 000)	(+ 500, 000)	(- 450, 000)
<i>Nonadministrative expenses</i> -----	(87, 000, 000)	(95, 600, 000)	(92, 000, 000)	(+ 5, 000, 000)	(- 3, 600, 000)
<i>Federal National Mortgage Association</i> ---	(9, 600, 000)	(10, 340, 000)	(10, 000, 000)	(+ 400, 000)	(- 340, 000)
<i>Total administrative expenses</i> -----	(130, 807, 000)	(142, 620, 000)	(138, 110, 000)	(+ 7, 303, 000)	(- 4, 510, 000)

¹ Amounts have not been reduced to reflect reserves established pursuant to Public Law 90-218. Proposed supplementals and interaccount transfers are excluded.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1968 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1969

[NOTE.—All amounts are in the form of "appropriations" unless otherwise indicated.]

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1968 (enacted to date) ¹ (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in the bill (4)	Bill compared with—	
				New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1968 (enacted to date) (5)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969 (6)
TITLE I					
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT					
NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL					
Salaries and expenses-----	\$524, 000	\$524, 000	\$500, 000	—\$24, 000	—\$24, 000
OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING					
Salaries and expenses-----	4, 700, 000	5, 043, 000	4, 850, 000	+150, 000	—193, 000
Salaries and expenses, telecommunications-----	1, 945, 000	1, 986, 000	1, 675, 000	—270, 000	—311, 000
Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies-----	3, 000, 000	3, 135, 000	3, 100, 000	+100, 000	—35, 000
Total, Office of Emergency Planning-----	9, 645, 000	10, 164, 000	9, 625, 000	—20, 000	—539, 000
OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY					
Salaries and expenses-----	1, 550, 000	1, 985, 000	1, 750, 000	+200, 000	—235, 000
Energy study-----	-----	500, 000	-----	-----	—500, 000
Total, Office of Science and Technology-----	1, 550, 000	2, 485, 000	1, 750, 000	+200, 000	—735, 000

PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON POSTAL ORGANIZATION					
Salaries and expenses-----	1, 000, 000				-1, 000, 000
Total, Executive Office of the President	12, 719, 000	13, 173, 000	11, 875, 000	-844, 000	-1, 298, 000
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
Appalachian regional development programs--	126, 700, 000	213, 600, 000	168, 600, 000	+41, 900, 000	-45, 000, 000
Disaster relief-----	20, 000, 000	15, 000, 000	5, 000, 000	-15, 000, 000	-10, 000, 000
Total, funds appropriated to the Pres- ident-----	146, 700, 000	228, 600, 000	173, 600, 000	+26, 900, 000	-55, 000, 000
INDEPENDENT OFFICES					
APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses-----	² 745, 750	879, 000	850, 000	+104, 250	-29, 000
CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD					
Salaries and expenses-----	8, 983, 000	9, 700, 000	9, 350, 000	+367, 000	-350, 000
<i>Payments to air carriers (appropriation to liqui- date contract authorization)</i> -----	³ (52, 500, 000)	(47, 600, 000)	(45, 000, 000)	(-7, 500, 000)	(-2, 600, 000)
Total, Civil Aeronautics Board-----	8, 983, 000	9, 700, 000	9, 350, 000	+367, 000	-350, 000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 40.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1968 AND BUDGET
ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1969—Continued**

[NOTE.—All amounts are in the form of "appropriations" unless otherwise indicated.]

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1968 (enacted to date) ¹ (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority fiscal year 1969 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in the bill (4)	Bill compared with—	
				New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1968 (enacted to date) (5)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969 (6)
TITLE I—Continued					
INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued					
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses:					
Appropriation-----	\$36, 000, 000	\$39, 309, 000	\$37, 000, 000	+\$1, 000, 000	—\$2, 309, 000
By transfer-----	(6, 100, 000)	(6, 460, 000)	(6, 460, 000)	(+360, 000)	-----
Annuities under special acts-----	1, 300, 000	1, 366, 000	1, 350, 000	+50, 000	—16, 000
Government payment for annuitants, employees health benefits-----	40, 748, 000	40, 780, 000	40, 748, 000	-----	—32, 000
Payment to civil service retirement and disability fund-----	71, 000, 000	72, 000, 000	72, 000, 000	+1, 000, 000	-----
Total, Civil Service Commission-----	149, 048, 000	153, 455, 000	151, 098, 000	+2, 050, 000	—2, 357, 000

COMMISSION ON THE POLITICAL ACTIVITY OF
GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL

Salaries and expenses-----	25, 000	-----	-----	-----	-25, 000	-----
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION						
Salaries and expenses-----	19, 100, 000	21, 271, 000	19, 750, 000		+ 650, 000	-1, 521, 000
FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION						
Salaries and expenses-----	14, 220, 000	16, 060, 000	15, 000, 000		+ 780, 000	-1, 060, 000
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION						
Salaries and expenses-----	15, 150, 000	16, 127, 000	16, 000, 000		+ 850, 000	-127, 000
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION						
Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service	260, 500, 000	278, 763, 000	271, 881, 000		+11, 381, 000	-6, 882, 000
Repair and improvement of public buildings	80, 000, 000	80, 000, 000	80, 000, 000		-----	-----
Construction, public buildings projects-----	63, 757, 900	-----	-----		-63, 757, 900	-----
Sites and expenses, public buildings projects--	20, 285, 000	10, 995, 000	10, 995, 000		-9, 290, 000	-----
Payments, public buildings purchase contracts-----	2, 350, 000	2, 400, 000	2, 400, 000		+50, 000	-----
Expenses, U.S. court facilities-----	1, 000, 000	1, 200, 000	750, 000		-250, 000	-450, 000
Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service--	68, 500, 000	76, 534, 000	72, 500, 000		+4, 000, 000	-4, 034, 000
Automatic data processing fund-----	10, 000, 000	-----	-----		-10, 000, 000	-----
Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service-----	17, 580, 000	18, 728, 300	18, 300, 000		+ 720, 000	-428, 300

See footnotes at end of table, p. 40.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1968 AND BUDGET
ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1969—Continued**

[NOTE.—All amounts are in the form of "appropriations" unless otherwise indicated.]

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1968, (enacted to date) ¹	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in the bill	Bill compared with— New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1968 (enacted to date) (5)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969 (6)
TITLE I—Continued					
INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued					
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION—Con.					
National historical publication grants-----	\$350, 000	\$350, 000	\$350, 000	-----	-----
Operating expenses, Transportation and Communications Service-----	5, 880, 000	6, 510, 000	6, 150, 000	+ \$270, 000	—\$360, 000
Operating expenses, Property Management and Disposal Service-----	27, 300, 000	30, 500, 000	28, 500, 000	+ 1, 200, 000	—2, 000, 000
Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator	1, 747, 000	1, 944, 000	1, 820, 000	+ 73, 000	—124, 000
Allowances and office facilities for former Presidents-----	235, 000	267, 000	267, 000	+ 32, 000	-----
Expenses, Presidential transition-----	-----	900, 000	900, 000	+ 900, 000	-----
<i>Administrative operations fund (limitation on administrative expenses)-----</i>	<i>(16, 650, 000)</i>	<i>(14, 165, 300)</i>	<i>(13, 700, 000)</i>	<i>(—2, 950, 000)</i>	<i>(—465, 300)</i>

Working capital fund-----	200, 000	-----	-----	-----	--200, 000
Total, General Services Administration-----	509, 291, 300	494, 813, 000	--64, 671, 900	-----	--14, 478, 300
INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses-----	23, 995, 000	23, 846, 000	+386, 000	-----	--149, 000
NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION					
Research and development-----	3, 677, 200, 000	3, 383, 250, 000	--541, 750, 000	-----	--293, 950, 000
Construction of facilities-----	45, 000, 000	21, 800, 000	--14, 100, 000	-----	--23, 200, 000
Administrative operations-----	648, 200, 000	603, 173, 000	--24, 827, 000	-----	--45, 027, 000
Total, National Aeronautics and Space Administration-----	4, 370, 400, 000	4, 008, 223, 000	--580, 677, 000	-----	--362, 177, 000
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION					
Salaries and expenses-----	500, 000, 000	400, 000, 000	--95, 000, 000	-----	--100, 000, 000
RENEGOTIATION BOARD					
Salaries and expenses-----	3, 080, 000	3, 000, 000	+400, 000	-----	--80, 000
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses-----	17, 903, 000	17, 730, 000	+380, 000	-----	--173, 000
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM					
Salaries and expenses-----	63, 568, 000	63, 568, 000	+6, 113, 000	-----	-----

See footnotes at end of table, p. 40.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1968 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1969—Continued

[Note.—All amounts are in the form of "appropriations" unless otherwise indicated.]

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1968 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority fiscal year 1969 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in the bill (4)	Bill compared with—	
				New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1968 (enacted to date) (5)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority fiscal year 1969 (6)
TITLE I—Continued					
INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued					
VETERANS ADMINISTRATION					
Compensation and pensions-----	\$4, 558, 000; 000	\$4, 654, 336, 000	\$4, 654, 336, 000	+\$96, 336, 000	-----
Readjustment benefits-----	427, 200, 000	617, 600, 000	612, 000, 000	+184, 800, 000	-----
Veterans insurance and indemnities-----	5, 150, 000	9, 350, 000	9, 350, 000	+4, 200, 000	-----
Medical care-----	1, 357, 293, 000	1, 420, 264, 000	1, 420, 264, 000	+62, 971, 000	-----
Medical and prosthetic research-----	45, 850, 000	47, 953, 000	45, 850, 000	-----	-----
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses-----	13, 975, 000	14, 734, 000	14, 200, 000	+225, 000	-----
General operating expenses-----	183, 221, 000	198, 549, 000	195, 000, 000	+11, 779, 000	-----
Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities-----	52, 600, 000	33, 338, 000	7, 926, 000	-----	-----
Grants for construction of State nursing homes-----	4, 000, 000	4, 000, 000	4, 000, 000	-----	-----
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines-----	1, 325, 000	1, 776, 000	776, 000	+451, 000	-----

<i>Loan guaranty revolving fund (limitation on obligations)</i> -----	(386, 046, 000)	Language	(450, 000, 000)	(+63, 954, 000)	(+450, 000, 000)
Participation sales authorization-----	850, 000, 000	515, 000, 000	-----	-850, 000, 000	-515, 000, 000
Payment of participation sales insufficiencies-----	665, 000	4 11, 580, 000	9, 505, 000	+8, 840, 000	-2, 075, 000
Total, Veterans Administration-----	7, 499, 279, 000	7, 528, 480, 000	6, 974, 207, 000	-525, 072, 000	-554, 273, 000
Total, independent offices-----	13, 450, 800, 650	13, 234, 209, 300	12, 197, 435, 000	-1,253,365,650	-1, 036, 774, 300
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE					
CIVIL DEFENSE					
Operation and maintenance-----	66, 100, 000	5 55, 200, 000	5 48, 040, 000	-18, 060, 000	-7, 160, 000
Research, shelter survey and marking-----	20, 000, 000	21, 600, 000	10, 000, 000	-10, 000, 000	-11, 600, 000
Total, Civil Defense, Department of Defense-----	86, 100, 000	76, 800, 000	58, 040, 000	-28, 060, 000	-18, 760, 000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE					
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE					
Emergency health activities-----	9, 000, 000	2, 400, 000	-----	-9, 000, 000	-2, 400, 000

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1968 AND BUDGET
ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1969--Continued**

[NOTE.—All amounts are in the form of "appropriations" unless otherwise indicated.]

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1968 (enacted to date) ¹ (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority fiscal year 1969 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in the bill (4)	Bill compared with—	
				New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1968 (enacted to date) (5)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority fiscal year 1969 (6)
TITLE I—Continued					
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT					
RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE					
Housing for the elderly or handicapped fund—	⁶ \$25, 000, 000	⁷ \$25, 000, 000	\$25, 000, 000	-----	-----
Alaska housing-----	-----	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000	+ \$1, 000, 000	-----
Grants for neighborhood facilities-----	30, 000, 000	40, 000, 000	35, 000, 000	+ 5, 000, 000	—\$5, 000, 000
Urban renewal programs, 1969-----	750, 000, 000	(⁸)	-----	—750, 000, 000	-----
Low-rent public housing annual contributions--	275, 000, 000	358, 000, 000	350, 000, 000	+ 75, 000, 000	—8, 000, 000
Salaries and expenses-----	31, 950, 000	36, 360, 000	34, 000, 000	+ 2, 050, 000	—2, 360, 000
Total, renewal and housing assistance--	1, 111, 950, 000	460, 360, 000	445, 000, 000	—666, 950, 000	—15, 360, 000

METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT					
Urban planning grants-----	45, 000, 000	9 38, 838, 000	38, 838, 000	-6, 162, 000	-----
<i>Open space land programs (appropriation to liquidate contract authorization)</i> -----	(75, 000, 000)	(85, 000, 000)	(75, 000, 000)	-----	(-10, 000, 000)
Grants for basic water and sewer facilities----	165, 000, 000	150, 000, 000	150, 000, 000	-15, 000, 000	-----
Salaries and expenses-----	6, 100, 000	8, 700, 000	7, 000, 000	+900, 000	-1, 700, 000
Urban mass transportation grants, 1969-----	175, 000, 000	¹⁰ 15, 000, 000	-----	-175, 000, 000	-15, 000, 000
Total, metropolitan development-----	391, 100, 000	212, 538, 000	195, 838, 000	-195, 262, 000	-16, 700, 000
DEMONSTRATIONS AND INTERGOVERN- MENTAL RELATIONS					
Model cities programs-----	¹¹ 312, 000, 000	¹² 650, 000, 000	¹¹ 500, 000, 000	+188, 000, 000	-150, 000, 000
Urban information and technical assistance----	2, 200, 000	(¹³)	-----	-2, 200, 000	-----
Community development training programs----	3, 000, 000	7, 000, 000	3, 000, 000	-----	-4, 000, 000
Fellowships for city planning and urban studies--	500, 000	500, 000	500, 000	-----	-----

See footnotes at end of table, p. 40.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1968 AND BUDGET
ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1969—Continued**

[NOTE.—All amounts are in the form of "appropriations" unless otherwise indicated.]

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1968 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in the bill (4)	Bill compared with—	
				New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1968 (enacted to date) (5)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969 (6)
TITLE I—Continued					
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT--Continued					
DEMONSTRATIONS AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS--Continued					
Salaries and expenses:					
Appropriation-----	\$1, 850, 000	\$1, 860, 000	\$1, 860, 000	+\$10, 000	-----
By transfer-----	(2, 500, 000)	(8, 380, 000)	(6, 000, 000)	(+3, 500, 000)	(-\$2, 380, 000)
Urban research and technology-----	10, 000, 000	20, 000, 000	10, 000, 000	-----	-10, 000, 000
Low-income housing demonstration programs (appropriation to liquidate contract authorization)-----	(2, 000, 000)	(4, 496, 000)	(2, 000, 000)	-----	(-2, 496, 000)
Total, demonstrations and intergovernmental relations-----	329, 550, 000	679, 360, 000	515, 360, 000	+185, 810, 000	-164, 000, 000

MORTGAGE CREDIT					
Rent supplement program:					
<i>Increased limitation for annual contract authorization</i> -----	(10, 000, 000)	(65, 000, 000)	(25, 000, 000)	(+15, 000, 000)	(-40, 000, 000)
Appropriation for payments-----	5, 000, 000	15, 000, 000	12, 000, 000	+7, 000, 000	-3, 000, 000
Administrative expenses-----	1, 100, 000	1, 600, 000	1, 350, 000	+250, 000	-250, 000
Total, mortgage credit-----	6, 100, 000	16, 600, 000	13, 350, 000	+7, 250, 000	-3, 250, 000
DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT					
General administration-----	4, 000, 000	8, 000, 000	6, 000, 000	+2, 000, 000	-2, 000, 000
Regional management and services-----	5, 300, 000	8, 925, 000	6, 500, 000	+1, 200, 000	-2, 425, 000
Working capital fund-----	¹⁴ (1, 500, 000)	2, 000, 000	-----	(-1, 500, 000)	-2, 000, 000
Total, departmental management-----	9, 300, 000	18, 925, 000	12, 500, 000	+3, 200, 000	-6, 425, 000
PARTICIPATION SALES					
Participation sales authorization-----	2, 385, 000, 000	¹⁵ 1, 570, 000, 000	-----	-2, 385, 000, 000	-1, 570, 000, 000
Payment of participation sales insufficiencies-----	23, 000, 000	⁴ 57, 615, 000	47, 638, 000	+24, 638, 000	-9, 977, 000
Total, participation sales-----	2, 408, 000, 000	1, 627, 615, 000	47, 638, 000	-2, 360, 362, 000	-1, 579, 977, 000
Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development-----	4, 256, 000, 000	3, 015, 398, 000	1, 229, 686, 000	-3, 026, 314, 000	-1, 785, 712, 000
Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority-----	17, 961, 319, 650	16, 570, 580, 300	13, 670, 636, 000	-4, 290, 683, 650	-2, 899, 944, 300

See footnotes at end of table, p. 40.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1968 AND THE BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1969

[NOTE.—All amounts are in the form of "appropriations" unless otherwise indicated.]

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1968 (enacted to date) ¹ (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in the bill (4)	Bill compared with—	
				New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1968 (enacted to date) (5)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969 (6)
TITLE I—Continued					
Consisting of—					
Appropriations-----	¹⁶ \$14,726,319,650	\$14,460,580,300	\$13,670,636,000	-\$1,055,683,650	-\$789,944,300
Authorizations to spend agency debt receipts (participation certificates)-----	3,235,000,000	2,110,000,000	-----	-3,235,000,000	-2,110,000,000
Memoranda—					
Appropriations-----	¹⁶ (14,726,319,650)	(14,460,580,300)	(13,670,636,000)	(-1,055,683,650)	(-789,944,300)
Appropriations to liquidate contract authorizations-----	(129,500,000)	(137,096,000)	(122,000,000)	(-7,500,000)	(-15,096,000)
Total appropriations-----	¹⁶ (14,855,819,650)	(14,597,676,300)	(13,792,636,000)	(-1,063,183,650)	(-805,040,300)

¹ Amounts have not been reduced to reflect reserves established pursuant to Public Law 90-218. Proposed supplementals and interaccount transfers are excluded.

² Excludes \$11,000 reappropriation provided in P.L. 90-103 (Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1967).

³ Includes \$1,500,000 new budget (obligational) authority.

⁴ Estimated amount of indefinite appropriation.

⁵ Excludes \$500,000 transfer from Civil Defense Procurement Fund.

⁶ Additional financing provided through the sale of participation certificates.

⁷ Participation sales authorization.

⁸ \$1,400,000 advance funding for fiscal year 1970 not considered due to lack of legislative authorization.

⁹ Excludes \$16,162,000 not considered due to lack of legislative authorization.

¹⁰ Excludes \$230,000,000 advance funding for fiscal year 1970 not considered pending enactment of legislative authorization.

¹¹ Includes \$100,000,000 transfer to "Urban renewal programs".

¹² Excludes \$350,000,000 proposed transfer to "Urban renewal programs" which was not considered due to lack of legislative authorization. Includes \$150,000,000 for transfer to "Urban renewal programs".

¹³ \$5,000,000 not considered due to lack of legislative authorization.

¹⁴ By transfer.

¹⁵ Excludes \$25,000,000 new budget (obligational) authority included under "Housing for the elderly or handicapped fund".

¹⁶ Includes \$925,000,000 advance funding for fiscal year 1969.

Union Calendar No. 539

90TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 17023

[Report No. 1348]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 3, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the following bill; which was committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

A BILL

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for sundry inde-
5 pendent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corpora-

1 tions, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing
2 and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June
3 30, 1969, and for other purposes, namely:

4 TITLE I

5 EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

6 NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL

7 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

8 For expenses necessary for the National Aeronautics and
9 Space Council, established by section 201 of the National
10 Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C.
11 2471), including hire of passenger motor vehicles, reimburse-
12 ment of the General Services Administration for security
13 guard services, and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109,
14 \$500,000.

15 OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING

16 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

17 For expenses necessary for the Office of Emergency
18 Planning, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109,
19 reimbursement of the General Services Administration for
20 security guard services, hire of passenger motor vehicles, and
21 expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and individuals
22 at meetings concerned with the work of emergency planning,
23 \$4,850,000.

24 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, TELECOMMUNICATIONS

25 For expenses necessary for the conduct of telecommuni-
26 cations functions assigned to the Director of Telecommunica-

1 tions Management, including services as authorized by 5
2 U.S.C. 3109, \$1,675,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed
3 \$500,000 of the foregoing amount shall remain available for
4 telecommunications studies and research until expended.

5 CIVIL DEFENSE AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION FUNCTIONS
6 OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

7 For expenses necessary to assist other Federal agencies
8 to perform civil defense and defense mobilization functions,
9 including payments by the Department of Labor to
10 State employment security agencies for the full cost of admin-
11 istration of defense manpower mobilization activities,
12 \$3,100,000.

13 OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
14 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

15 For expenses necessary for the Office of Science and
16 Technology, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C.
17 3109, \$1,750,000.

18 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT
19 APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

20 For expenses necessary to carry out the programs au-
21 thorized by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of
22 1965, as amended, except expenses authorized by section
23 105 of said Act, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C.
24 3109, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$168,600,000,
25 to remain available until expended.

DISASTER RELIEF

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1855-1855g) and section 9 of the Disaster Relief Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-769), authorizing assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed 3 per centum of the foregoing amount shall be available for administrative expenses.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Cochairman and his alternate on the Appalachian Regional Commission and for payment of the Federal share of the administrative expenses of the Commission, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$850,000.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board, including hire of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902);

1 and not to exceed \$1,000 for official reception and repre-
2 sentation expenses, \$9,350,000.

3 PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS (LIQUIDATION OF
4 CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

5 For payments to air carriers of so much of the compen-
6 sation fixed and determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board
7 under section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49
8 U.S.C. 1376), as is payable by the Board, \$45,000,000, to
9 remain available until expended.

10 CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

11 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

12 For necessary expenses, including services as authorized
13 by 5 U.S.C. 3109; not to exceed \$10,000 for medical exam-
14 inations performed for veterans by private physicians on a
15 fee basis; payment in advance for library membership in
16 societies whose publications are available to members only
17 or to members at a price lower than to the general public;
18 not to exceed \$161,000 for performing the duties imposed
19 upon the Commission by chapter 15 of title 5, United States
20 Code; and not to exceed \$1,000 for official reception and
21 representation expenses; \$37,000,000, including funding of
22 Interagency Boards of Examiners, together with not to exceed
23 \$6,460,000 for necessary expenses incurred during the cur-

1 rent fiscal year in the administration of the retirement and
2 insurance programs, to be transferred from the trust funds
3 “Civil Service retirement and disability fund”, “Employees
4 life insurance fund”, “Employees health benefits fund”, and
5 “Retired employees health benefits fund”, in such amounts as
6 may be determined by the Civil Service Commission, with-
7 out regard to the provisions of any other Act, but this pro-
8 vision shall not affect the authority of 5 U.S.C. 8348 (a) and
9 section 1 (b) of Public Law 89-205 (79 Stat. 840), pro-
10 viding for additional administrative expenses to effect an-
11 nuity adjustments under 5 U.S.C. 8340, section 1 (c) of
12 Public Law 89-205 (79 Stat. 840) and section 1 of
13 Public Law 89-314 (79 Stat. 1162) : *Provided*, That
14 \$700,000 of this appropriation shall be available to carry
15 out the provisions of Executive Order 10422 of January 9,
16 1953, as amended, prescribing procedures for making avail-
17 able to the Secretary General of the United Nations, and the
18 executive heads of other international organizations, certain
19 information concerning United States citizens employed, or
20 being considered for employment by such organizations, in-
21 cluding advances or reimbursements to the applicable appro-
22 priations or funds of the Civil Service Commission and the
23 Federal Bureau of Investigation for expenses incurred by
24 such agencies under said Executive Order: *Provided further*,

1 That members of the International Organizations Employees
2 Loyalty Board may be paid actual transportation expenses,
3 and per diem in lieu of subsistence under 5 U.S.C. 5702,
4 while traveling on official business away from their homes or
5 regular places of business, including periods while en route
6 to and from and at the place where their services are to be
7 performed.

8 No part of the appropriations herein made to the Civil
9 Service Commission shall be available for the salaries and
10 expenses of the Legal Examining Unit in the Examining and
11 Personnel Utilization Division of the Commission, established
12 pursuant to Executive Order 9358 of July 1, 1943.

13 ANNUITIES UNDER SPECIAL ACTS

14 For payment of annuities authorized by the Act of
15 May 29, 1944, as amended (48 U.S.C. 1373a), and the Act
16 of August 19, 1950, as amended (33 U.S.C. 771-775),
17 \$1,350,000.

18 GOVERNMENT PAYMENT FOR ANNUITANTS, EMPLOYEES

19 HEALTH BENEFITS

20 For payment of Government contributions with respect
21 to retired employees, as authorized by chapter 89 of title 5,
22 United States Code, and the Retired Federal Employees
23 Health Benefits Act (74 Stat. 849), as amended, \$40,-
24 748,000, to remain available until expended.

1	PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND
2	DISABILITY FUND

3 For financing the estimated cost of new and increased
4 annuity benefits, during the current fiscal year, as provided
5 by part III of Public Law 87-793 (76 Stat. 868), \$72,000,-
6 000, to be credited to the civil service retirement and dis-
7 ability fund.

8 FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
9 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in performing the duties of the Commission as authorized by law, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902) ; not to exceed \$41,000 for land and structures; not to exceed \$11,000 for improvement and care of grounds and repairs to buildings; not to exceed \$500 for official reception and representation expenses; special counsel fees; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; and purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only, \$19,750,000.

19	FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION
20	SALARIES AND EXPENSES

21 For expenses necessary for the work of the Commission,
22 as authorized by law, including hire of passenger motor
23 vehicles, services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and not
24 to exceed \$500 for official reception and representation ex-
25 penses, \$15,000,000.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commission, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902), and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$16,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be expended upon any investigation hereafter provided by concurrent resolution of the Congress until funds are appropriated subsequently to the enactment of such resolution to finance the cost of such investigation.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

OPERATING EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of real property management and related activities as provided by law; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia; restoration of leased premises; moving Government agencies (including space adjustments) in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer of building space; acquisition by purchase or otherwise of real estate and interests therein; and contractual services incident to cleaning or servicing buildings and moving; \$271,881,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available to provide such fencing, lighting, guard booths, and other facilities

1 on private or other property not in Government ownership
2 or control as may be appropriate to enable the United
3 States Secret Service to perform its protective functions
4 pursuant to title 18, U.S.C. 3056.

5 REPAIR AND IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

6 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to
7 alter public buildings and to acquire additions to sites pursu-
8 ant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479) and
9 to alter other Federally-owned buildings and to acquire
10 additions to sites thereof, including grounds, approaches and
11 appurtenances, wharves and piers, together with the neces-
12 sary dredging adjacent thereto; and care and safeguarding of
13 sites; preliminary planning of projects by contract or other-
14 wise; maintenance, preservation, demolition, and equipment;
15 \$80,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*,
16 That for the purposes of this appropriation, buildings con-
17 structed pursuant to the Public Buildings Purchase Contract
18 Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356) and the Post Office Depart-
19 ment Property Act of 1954 (39 U.S.C. 2104 et seq.), and
20 buildings under the control of another department or agency
21 where alteration of such buildings is required in connection
22 with the moving of such other department or agency from
23 buildings then, or thereafter to be, under the control of Gen-
24 eral Services Administration shall be considered to be public
25 buildings.

1 SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

2 For an additional amount for expenses necessary in
3 connection with the construction of public buildings projects
4 not otherwise provided for, as specified under this head in
5 the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts of 1959 and
6 1960, including preliminary planning of public buildings
7 projects by contract or otherwise, \$10,995,000, to remain
8 available until expended.

9 PAYMENTS, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PURCHASE CONTRACTS

10 For payments of principal, interest, taxes, and any other
11 obligations under contracts entered into pursuant to the
12 Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C.
13 356), \$2,400,000.

14 EXPENSES, UNITED STATES COURT FACILITIES

15 For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, to
16 provide directly or indirectly, additional space for the United
17 States Courts incident to expansion of facilities (including
18 rental of buildings in the District of Columbia and elsewhere
19 and moving and space adjustments), and furniture and fur-
20 nishings, \$750,000.

21 OPERATING EXPENSES, FEDERAL SUPPLY SERVICE

22 For expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary for sup-
23 ply distribution, procurement, inspection, operation of the
24 stores depot system (including contractual services incident

1 to receiving, handling, and shipping warehouse items), and
2 other supply management and related activities, as authorized
3 by law, \$72,500,000.

4 OPERATING EXPENSES, NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND
5 RECORDS SERVICE

6 For necessary expenses in connection with Federal
7 records management and related activities, as provided by
8 law, including reimbursement for security guard services,
9 and contractual services incident to movement or disposal of
10 records, \$18,300,000.

11 NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS GRANTS

12 For allocation to Federal agencies, and for grants to
13 State and local agencies and nonprofit organizations and in-
14 stitutions, for the collecting, describing, preserving and com-
15 piling, and publishing of documentary sources significant to
16 the history of the United States, \$350,000, to remain avail-
17 able until expended.

18 OPERATING EXPENSES, TRANSPORTATION AND
19 COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE

20 For necessary expenses of transportation, communica-
21 tions, and other public utilities management and related
22 activities, as provided by law, including services as author-
23 ized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$6,150,000.

1 OPERATING EXPENSES, PROPERTY MANAGEMENT AND
2 DISPOSAL SERVICE

3 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary
4 for carrying out the functions of the Administrator with
5 respect to the utilization of excess property; the disposal
6 of surplus property; the rehabilitation of personal property;
7 the appraisal of real and personal property; the national
8 stockpile established by the Strategic and Critical Materials
9 Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98-98h) ; the supplemental
10 stockpile established by section 104 (b) of the Agricultural
11 Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat.
12 456, as amended by 73 Stat. 607) ; the national industrial
13 reserve established by the National Industrial Reserve Act
14 of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451-462) ; including services as
15 authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and reimbursement for
16 security guard services, \$28,500,000, to be derived from
17 proceeds from transfers of excess property, disposal of surplus
18 property, and sales of stockpile materials: *Provided*, That
19 during the current fiscal year the General Services Adminis-
20 tration is authorized to acquire leasehold interests in prop-
21 erty, for periods not in excess of twenty years, for the
22 storage, security, and maintenance of strategic, critical, and
23 other materials in the national and supplemental stockpiles

1 provided said leasehold interests are at nominal cost to the
2 Government: *Provided further*, That during the current
3 fiscal year there shall be no limitation on the value of surplus
4 strategic and critical materials which, in accordance with
5 section 6 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling
6 Act (50 U.S.C. 98e), may be transferred without reim-
7 bursement to the national stockpile: *Provided further*, That
8 during the current fiscal year materials in the inventory
9 maintained under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as
10 amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2061-2166), and excess ma-
11 terials in the national stockpile and the supplemental stock-
12 pile, the disposition of which is authorized by law, shall be
13 available, without reimbursement, for transfer at fair market
14 value to contractors as payment for expenses (including
15 transportation and other accessorial expenses) of acquisition
16 of materials, or of refining, processing, or otherwise bene-
17 ficiating materials, or of rotating materials, pursuant to sec-
18 tion 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling
19 Act (50 U.S.C. 98b), and of processing and refining ma-
20 terials pursuant to section 303 (d) of the Defense Production
21 Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2093 (d)).

22 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

23 For expenses of executive direction for activities under
24 the control of the General Services Administration, \$1,820,-

1 000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$500 shall be available
2 for reception and representation expenses.

3 ALLOWANCES AND OFFICE FACILITIES FOR FORMER
4 PRESIDENTS

5 For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August
6 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 838), \$267,000: *Provided*, That the
7 Administrator of General Services shall transfer to the Secre-
8 tary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to carry
9 out the provisions of sections (a) and (e) of such Act.

10 EXPENSES, PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION

11 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the
12 Presidential Transition Act of 1963 (3 U.S.C. 102, note),
13 \$900,000, to remain available until June 30, 1970.

14 ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS FUND

15 Funds available to General Services Administration for
16 administrative operations, in support of program activities,
17 shall be expended and accounted for, as a whole, through a
18 single fund: *Provided*, That costs and obligations for such
19 administrative operations for the respective program activ-
20 ities shall be accounted for in accordance with systems ap-
21 proved by the General Accounting Office: *Provided further*,
22 That the total amount deposited into said account for the cur-
23 rent fiscal year from funds made available to General Services
24 Administration in this Act shall not exceed \$13,700,000:

1 *Provided further*, That amounts deposited into said account
2 for administrative operations for each program shall not
3 exceed the amounts included in the respective program
4 appropriations for such purposes.

5 GENERAL PROVISIONS

6 The appropriate appropriation or fund available to the
7 General Services Administration shall be credited with (1)
8 cost of operation, protection, maintenance, upkeep, repair,
9 and improvement, included as part of rentals received from
10 Government corporations pursuant to law (40 U.S.C. 129) ;
11 (2) reimbursements for services performed in respect to
12 bonds and other obligations under the jurisdiction of the
13 General Services Administration, issued by public authori-
14 ties, States, or other public bodies, and such services in re-
15 spect to such bonds or obligations as the Administrator
16 deems necessary and in the public interest may, upon the
17 request and at the expense of the issuing agencies, be pro-
18 vided from the appropriate foregoing appropriation; and
19 (3) appropriations or funds available to other agencies, and
20 transferred to the General Services Administration, in con-
21 nection with property transferred to the General Services
22 Administration pursuant to the Act of July 2, 1948 (50
23 U.S.C. 451ff), and such appropriations or funds may be so
24 transferred, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.
25 Appropriations to the General Services Administration

1 under the heading "Construction, Public Buildings Projects"
2 shall be available, subject to the provisions of the Public
3 Buildings Act of 1959 for (1) acquisition of buildings and
4 sites thereof by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, in-
5 cluding prepayment of purchase contracts, (2) extension or
6 conversion of Government-owned buildings, and (3) con-
7 struction of new buildings, in addition to those set forth under
8 that appropriation: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall
9 authorize an expenditure of funds for acquisition, extension or
10 conversion, or construction without the approval of the Com-
11 mittees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of
12 Representatives.

13 Funds available to the General Services Administration
14 shall be available for the hire of passenger motor vehicles.

15 No part of any money appropriated by this or any
16 other Act for any agency of the executive branch of the
17 Government shall be used during the current fiscal year for
18 the purchase within the continental limits of the United
19 States of any typewriting machines except in accordance
20 with regulations issued pursuant to the provisions of the
21 Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949,
22 as amended.

23 Not to exceed 2 per centum of any appropriation made
24 available to the General Services Administration for the

1 current fiscal year by this Act may be transferred to any
2 other such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be
3 increased thereby more than 2 per centum: *Provided*, That
4 such transfers shall apply only to operating expenses, and
5 shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount of \$2,000,000.

6 Appropriations available to any department or agency
7 during the current fiscal year for necessary expenses, includ-
8 ing maintenance or operating expenses, shall also be available
9 for (a) reimbursement to the General Services Administra-
10 tion for those expenses of renovation and alteration of build-
11 ings and facilities which constitute public improvements, per-
12 formed in accordance with the Public Buildings Act of 1959
13 (73 Stat. 479) or other applicable law, and (b) transfer or
14 reimbursement to applicable appropriations to said Adminis-
15 tration for rents and related expenses, not otherwise provided
16 for, of providing subject to Executive Order 11035, dated
17 July 9, 1962, directly or indirectly, suitable general purpose
18 space for any such department or agency, in the District of
19 Columbia or elsewhere.

20 No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall
21 be used for the payment of rental on lease agreements for the
22 accommodation of Federal agencies in buildings and improve-
23 ments which are to be erected by the lessor for such agencies
24 at an estimated cost of construction in excess of \$200,000 or
25 for the payment of the salary of any person who executes

1 such a lease agreement: *Provided*, That the foregoing proviso
2 shall not be applicable to projects for which a prospectus for
3 the lease construction of space has been submitted to the Con-
4 gress and approval made in the same manner as for the
5 public buildings construction projects pursuant to the Public
6 Buildings Act of 1959.

7 INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

8 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

9 For necessary expenses of the Interstate Commerce
10 Commission, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C.
11 3109, \$23,846,000: *Provided*, That Joint Board members
12 and cooperating State commissioners may use Government
13 transportation requests when traveling in connection with
14 their duties as such.

15 NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE

16 ADMINISTRATION

17 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

18 For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for,
19 including research, development, operations, services, minor
20 construction, supplies, materials, equipment; maintenance, re-
21 pair, and alteration of real and personal property; and pur-
22 chase, hire, maintenance, and operation of other than admin-
23 istrative aircraft necessary for the conduct and support of
24 aeronautical and space research and development activities of

1 the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, \$3,383,-
2 250,000, to remain available until expended.

3 CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

4 For advance planning, design, and construction of facili-
5 ties for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration,
6 and for the acquisition or condemnation of real property, as
7 authorized by law, \$21,800,000, to remain available until
8 expended.

9 ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS

10 For necessary expenses of operation of the National
11 Aeronautics and Space Administration, not otherwise pro-
12 vided for, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as au-
13 thorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902) ; minor construc-
14 tion; supplies, materials, services, and equipment; awards;
15 hire, maintenance and operation of administrative aircraft;
16 purchase (not to exceed ten for replacement only) and hire
17 of passenger motor vehicles; and maintenance, repair, and
18 alteration of real and personal property; \$603,173,000: *Pro-*
19 *vided*, That contracts may be entered into under this appro-
20 priation for maintenance and operation of facilities, and for
21 other services, to be provided during the next fiscal year.

22 GENERAL PROVISIONS

23 Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation made
24 available to the National Aeronautics and Space Adminis-

1 tration by this Act may be transferred to any other such
2 appropriation.

3 Not to exceed \$35,000 of the appropriation "Adminis-
4 trative Operations" in this Act for the National Aeronautics
5 and Space Administration shall be available for scientific
6 consultations or extraordinary expense, to be expended upon
7 the approval or authority of the Administrator and his deter-
8 mination shall be final and conclusive.

9 NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

10 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

11 For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the
12 National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42
13 U.S.C. 1861-1875) Title IX of the National Defense Edu-
14 cation Act of 1958 (42 U.S.C. 1876-1879), the National
15 Sea Grant Colleges and Program Act of 1966 (80 Stat.
16 998), and the Act to establish a National Medal of Science
17 (42 U.S.C. 1880-1881), including award of graduate fellow-
18 ships; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; maintenance
19 and operation of three aircraft and purchase of flight services
20 for research support; hire of passenger motor vehicles; not
21 to exceed \$2,500 for official reception and representation ex-
22 penses; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by
23 law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902); rental of conference rooms in
24 the District of Columbia; and reimbursement of the General

1 Services Administration for security guard services; \$400,-
2 000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That
3 of the foregoing amount not less than \$37,600,000 shall be
4 available for tuition, grants, and allowances in connection
5 with a program of supplementary training for secondary
6 school science and mathematics teachers: *Provided further*,
7 That receipts for scientific support services and materials
8 furnished by the National Research Centers may be credited
9 to this appropriation.

10 RENEGOTIATION BOARD

11 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

12 For necessary expenses of the Renegotiation Board, in-
13 cluding hire of passenger motor vehicles and services as
14 authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$3,000,000.

15 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

16 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

17 For necessary expenses, including uniforms or allow-
18 ances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902),
19 and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$17,730,000.

20 SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

21 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

22 For expenses necessary for the operation and mainte-
23 nance of the Selective Service System, as authorized by title
24 I of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 (62 Stat.
25 604), as amended, including services as authorized by 5

1 U.S.C. 3109; expenses of attendance at meetings and of
2 training for uniformed personnel assigned to the Selective
3 Service System, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2301-
4 2318) for civilian employees; hire of motor vehicles; pur-
5 chase of thirteen passenger motor vehicles for replacement
6 only; not to exceed \$71,000 for the National Selective Serv-
7 ice Appeal Board; and \$60,000 for the National Advisory
8 Committee on the Selection of Physicians, Dentists, and
9 Allied Specialists; \$63,568,000: *Provided*, That during the
10 current fiscal year, the President may exempt this appro-
11 priation from the provisions of subsection (c) of section
12 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, whenever he
13 deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national
14 defense.

15 VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

16 COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

17 For the payment of compensation, pensions, gratuities,
18 and allowances, including burial awards, burial flags, sub-
19 sistence allowances for vocational rehabilitation, emergency
20 and other officers' retirement pay, adjusted-service credits
21 and certificates, as authorized by law; and for payment of
22 amounts of compromises or settlements under 28 U.S.C.
23 2677 of tort claims potentially subject to the offset provisions
24 of 38 U.S.C. 351, \$4,654,336,000, to remain available until
25 expended.

1 READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

2 For the payment of readjustment and rehabilitation
3 benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by law (38
4 U.S.C. chapters 21, 31 (except section 1504), and 33-39),
5 \$612,000,000, to remain available until expended.

6 VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

7 For military and naval insurance, national service life
8 insurance, servicemen's indemnities, and service-disabled
9 veterans insurance, to remain available until expended,
10 \$11,850,000, of which \$2,500,000 shall be derived from the
11 Veterans Special Term Insurance Fund.

12 MEDICAL CARE

13 For expenses necessary for the maintenance and opera-
14 tion of hospitals, nursing homes, and domiciliary facilities;
15 for furnishing, as authorized by law, inpatient and out-
16 patient care and treatment to beneficiaries of the Veterans
17 Administration including care and treatment in facilities
18 not under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration,
19 and furnishing recreational facilities, supplies and equipment;
20 maintenance and operation of farms and burial grounds;
21 repairing, altering, improving or providing facilities in the
22 several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the
23 Veterans Administration, not otherwise provided for, either
24 by contract or by the hire of temporary employees and pur-

1 chase of materials; uniforms or allowance therefor as author-
2 ized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902) ; and aid to State homes
3 as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 641) ; \$1,420,264,000,
4 plus reimbursements: *Provided*, That allotments and trans-
5 fers may be made from this appropriation to the Public
6 Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and
7 Welfare, and the Army, Navy, and Air Force of the De-
8 partment of Defense, for disbursements by them under the
9 various headings of their applicable appropriations, of such
10 amounts as are necessary for the care and treatment of bene-
11 ficiaries of the Veterans Administration.

12 MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH

13 For expenses necessary for carrying out programs of
14 medical and prosthetic research and development, as author-
15 ized by law, to remain available until expended, \$45,850,-
16 000.

17 MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS

18 OPERATING EXPENSES

19 For expenses necessary for administration of the medical,
20 hospital, domiciliary, construction and supply, research,
21 employee education and training activities, as authorized by
22 law, and for carrying out the provisions of section 5055, title
23 38, United States Code, relating to pilot programs and grants
24 for exchange of medical information, \$14,200,000.

1 GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

2 For necessary operating expenses of the Veterans Ad-
3 ministration, not otherwise provided for, including uniforms
4 or allowances therefor, as authorized by law; not to exceed
5 \$1,000 for official reception and representation expenses;
6 purchase of one passenger motor vehicle (medium sedan
7 for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles;
8 and reimbursement of the General Services Administration
9 for security guard services; \$195,000,000: *Provided*, That
10 no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay in excess of
11 twenty-two persons engaged in public relations work.

12 CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY
13 FACILITIES

14 For hospital and domiciliary facilities, for planning and
15 for major alterations, improvements, and repairs and extend-
16 ing any of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the Veterans
17 Administration or for any of the purposes set forth in sections
18 5001, 5002, and 5004, title 38, United States Code, includ-
19 ing necessary expenses of administration, \$7,926,000, to
20 remain available until expended.

21 GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF STATE NURSING HOMES

22 For grants to assist the several States to construct State
23 home facilities for furnishing nursing home care to veterans,
24 as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 5031-5037), \$4,000,000,
25 to remain available until June 30, 1971.

1 GRANTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

2 For payment to the Republic of the Philippines of
3 grants, as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 631-634),
4 \$1,776,000.

5 LOAN GUARANTY REVOLVING FUND

6 During the current fiscal year, the Loan guaranty revolv-
7 ing fund shall be available for expenses, but not to exceed
8 \$450,000,000, for property acquisitions and other loan guar-
9 anty and insurance operations under Chapter 37, title 38,
10 United States Code, except administrative expenses, as au-
11 thorized by section 1824 of such title: *Provided*, That the
12 unobligated balances including retained earnings of the Direct
13 loan revolving fund shall be available, during the current
14 fiscal year, for transfer to the Loan guaranty revolving fund
15 in such amounts as may be necessary to provide for the
16 timely payment of obligations of such fund and the Admin-
17 istrator of Veterans Affairs shall not be required to pay inter-
18 est on amounts so transferred after the time of such transfer.

19 PAYMENT OF PARTICIPATION SALES INSUFFICIENCIES

20 For the payment of such insufficiencies as may be re-
21 quired by the Federal National Mortgage Association, as
22 trustee, on account of outstanding beneficial interests or par-
23 ticipations in Direct Loan Revolving Fund assets or Loan
24 Guaranty Revolving Fund assets authorized by law to be

1 issued pursuant to section 302 (c) of the Federal National
2 Mortgage Association Charter Act, as amended, \$9,505,000.

3 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

4 Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation for the
5 current fiscal year for "Compensation and pensions", "Re-
6 adjustment benefits", and "Veterans insurance and indemni-
7 ties" may be transferred to any other of the mentioned ap-
8 propriations, but not to exceed 10 per centum of the appro-
9 priations so augmented.

10 Appropriations available to the Veterans Administra-
11 tion for the current fiscal year for salaries and expenses
12 shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C.
13 3109.

14 The appropriation available to the Veterans Administra-
15 tion for the current fiscal year for "Medical care" shall be
16 available for funeral, burial, and other expenses incidental
17 thereto (except burial awards authorized by 38 U.S.C. 902),
18 for beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration receiving
19 care under such appropriations.

20 No part of the appropriations in this Act for the Veter-
21 ans Administration (except the appropriation for "Construc-
22 tion of hospital and domiciliary facilities") shall be available
23 for the purchase of any site for or toward the construction
24 of any new hospital or home.

25 No part of the foregoing appropriations shall be avail-

1 able for hospitalization or examination of any persons except
 2 beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such benefits
 3 to veterans, unless reimbursement of cost is made to the ap-
 4 propriation at such rates as may be fixed by the Administra-
 5 tor of Veterans Affairs.

6 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

7 CIVIL DEFENSE

8 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

9 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for
 10 carrying out civil defense activities, including the hire of
 11 motor vehicles; and financial contributions to the States for
 12 civil defense purposes, as authorized by law, \$48,040,000,
 13 and in addition, \$500,000 which shall be derived by transfer
 14 from Civil Defense Procurement Fund established by the
 15 Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (50 U.S.C.
 16 App. 2264): *Provided*, That not to exceed \$18,500,000
 17 shall be available for allocation under section 205 of the Fed-
 18 eral Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended.

19 RESEARCH, SHELTER SURVEY AND MARKING

20 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for
 21 studies and research to develop measures and plans for civil
 22 defense; and continuing shelter surveys, marking, stocking;
 23 and equipping surveyed spaces; \$10,000,000, to remain
 24 available until expended.

1 GENERAL PROVISIONS—CIVIL DEFENSE

2 Appropriations contained in this Act for carrying out
3 civil defense activities shall not be available in excess of the
4 limitations on appropriations contained in section 408 of the
5 Federal Civil Defense Act, as amended (50 U.S.C. App.
6 2260).

7 No part of any appropriation in this Act shall be
8 available for the construction of warehouses or for the lease
9 of warehouse space in any building which is to be constructed
10 specifically for civil defense activities.

11 DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN
12 DEVELOPMENT

13 RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE

14 HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY OR HANDICAPPED FUND

15 For the revolving fund established pursuant to section
16 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended (12 U.S.C.
17 1701q et seq.), \$25,000,000, to remain available until
18 expended.

19 ALASKA HOUSING

20 For assistance in the provision of housing and related
21 facilities for Alaska natives and other Alaska residents, as
22 authorized by section 1004 of the Demonstration Cities and
23 Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (80 Stat. 1284-
24 1285), \$1,000,000.

GRANTS FOR NEIGHBORHOOD FACILITIES

For grants authorized by section 703 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3103), \$35,000,000, to remain available until expended.

LOW RENT PUBLIC HOUSING ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

For the payment of annual contributions to public housing agencies in accordance with section 10 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1410), \$350,000,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary administrative expenses of programs of renewal and housing assistance, not otherwise provided for, \$34,000,000.

METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT

URBAN PLANNING GRANTS

For an additional amount for "Urban planning grants", \$38,838,000, to remain available until expended.

OPEN SPACE LAND PROGRAMS

For grants as authorized by title VII of the Housing Act of 1961, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1500-1500e), and the provision of technical assistance to State and local public bodies (including the undertaking of studies and publication of information), \$75,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation in this

1 Act shall be used for administrative expenses in connection
2 with commitments entered into during the current fiscal
3 year for grants aggregating more than the total amounts
4 available in the current year from amounts heretofore appro-
5 priated for making such commitments through June 30,
6 1967, plus the additional amount appropriated herein: *Pro-*
7 *vided further*, That no part of this appropriation may be
8 used for financing a grant in excess of 50 per centum of the
9 cost of any activity or project.

10 GRANTS FOR BASIC WATER AND SEWER FACILITIES

11 For grants authorized by section 702 of the Housing
12 and Urban Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3102),
13 \$150,000,000, to remain available until expended.

14 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

15 For necessary administrative expenses of programs of
16 metropolitan development, not otherwise provided for,
17 \$7,000,000.

18 DEMONSTRATIONS AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

19 MODEL CITIES PROGRAMS

20 For financial assistance and administrative expenses in
21 connection with planning and carrying out comprehensive
22 city demonstration programs, as authorized by title I of the
23 Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act
24 of 1966 (80 Stat. 1255-1261), including \$100,000,000
25 for grants for urban renewal projects within approved city

1 demonstration programs, to be transferred to and merged
2 with the appropriation "Urban renewal programs" for the
3 fiscal year 1969 in accordance with and subject to the provi-
4 sions of section 113 of said Act, \$500,000,000: *Provided*,
5 That the amount appropriated herein for other than urban
6 renewal programs shall remain available until June 30, 1970.

7 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT TRAINING PROGRAMS

8 For matching grants to States for training and related
9 activities, and for expenses of providing technical assistance
10 to State and local governmental or public bodies (including
11 studies and publication of information), as authorized by
12 title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964 (20 U.S.C. 801-
13 805), \$3,000,000.

14 FELLOWSHIPS FOR CITY PLANNING AND URBAN STUDIES

15 For fellowships for city planning and urban studies as
16 authorized by section 810 of the Housing Act of 1964 (20
17 U.S.C. 811), \$500,000.

18 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

19 For necessary administrative expenses of programs of
20 demonstrations and intergovernmental relations, not other-
21 wise provided for, \$1,860,000, together with not to exceed
22 \$6,000,000 to be derived from the appropriation for "Model
23 cities programs": *Provided*, That no part of this or any other
24 appropriation in this Act may be used to provide metro-
25 politan expeditors, or for the administration or implementa-

tion of section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-754).

URBAN RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

For necessary expenses of programs of research and studies relating to housing and urban problems, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by law (12 U.S.C. 1701d-3; 1701e; 1701f; 79 Stat. 668; 80 Stat. 1286-1287), \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$500,000 of the foregoing amount shall be available for administrative expenses.

LOW INCOME HOUSING DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS

For low income housing demonstration programs pursuant to section 207 of the Housing Act of 1961, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1436), \$2,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation in this Act shall be available for administrative expenses in connection with contracts to make grants in excess of the amount herein appropriated.

MORTGAGE CREDIT

RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM

For rent supplement payments authorized by section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, \$12,000,000: *Provided*, That the limitation otherwise applicable to the maximum payments that may be required in any fiscal year by all contracts entered into under such section is increased by \$25,000,000: *Provided further*, That

1 no part of the foregoing appropriation or contract authority
2 shall be used for incurring any obligation in connection with
3 any dwelling unit or project which is not either part of a
4 workable program for community improvement meeting the
5 requirements of section 101 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949,
6 as amended (42 U.S.C. 1451 (c)), or which is without
7 local official approval for participation in this program.

8 For necessary administrative expenses of the Federal
9 Housing Administration in carrying out functions under sec-
10 tion 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of
11 1965, delegated by the Secretary, \$1,350,000.

12 DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

13 GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

14 For necessary administrative expenses of the Secretary,
15 not otherwise provided for, in overall program planning
16 and direction in the Department, including not to exceed
17 \$2,500 for official reception and representation expenses,
18 \$6,000,000.

19 REGIONAL MANAGEMENT AND SERVICES

20 For necessary administrative expenses, not otherwise
21 provided for, of management and program coordination in
22 the regional offices of the Department, \$6,500,000.

23 PAYMENT OF PARTICIPATION SALES INSUFFICIENCIES

24 For the payment of such insufficiencies as may be re-
25 quired by the Federal National Mortgage Association, as

1 trustee, on account of outstanding beneficial interests or par-
2 ticipations in assets of the Department of Housing and Urban
3 Development (including the Federal National Mortgage
4 Association) authorized by law to be issued pursuant to sec-
5 tion 302 (c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association
6 Charter Act, as amended, \$47,638,000.

7 GENERAL PROVISIONS

8 SEC. 102. Where appropriations in this title are expend-
9 able for travel expenses of employees and no specific limita-
10 tion has been placed thereon, the expenditures for such travel
11 expenses may not exceed the amounts set forth therefor in
12 the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations: *Pro-*
13 *vided*, That this section shall not apply to travel performed
14 by uncompensated officials of local boards and appeal boards
15 of the Selective Service System; to travel performed in con-
16 nection with the investigation of aircraft accidents by the
17 Civil Aeronautics Board; to travel performed directly in con-
18 nection with care and treatment of medical beneficiaries of
19 the Veterans Administration; or to payments to interagency
20 motor pool where separately set forth in the budget schedules.

21 SEC. 103. No part of any appropriation contained in this
22 title shall be available to pay the salary of any person filling
23 a position, other than a temporary position, formerly held by
24 an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces of the
25 United States and has satisfactorily completed his period of

1 active military or naval service and has within ninety days
2 after his release from such service or from hospitalization con-
3 tinuing after discharge for a period of not more than one year
4 made application for restoration to his former position and
5 has been certified by the Civil Service Commission as still
6 qualified to perform the duties of his former position and has
7 not been restored thereto.

8 SEC. 104. No part of any appropriation made available
9 by the provisions of this title shall be used for the purchase
10 or sale of real estate or for the purpose of establishing new
11 offices outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That this
12 limitation shall not apply to programs which have been
13 approved by the Congress and appropriations made therefor.

14 TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

15 The following corporations and agencies, respectively,
16 are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within
17 the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each
18 such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to
19 make such contracts and commitments without regard to
20 fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the
21 Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may
22 be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the
23 Budget for the current fiscal year for each such corporation
24 or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

1 FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD
2 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRA-
3 TIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK
4 BOARD

5 Not to exceed a total of \$5,000,000 shall be available
6 for administrative expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank
7 Board, which may procure services as authorized by 5 U.S.C.
8 3109, and contracts for such services with one organization
9 may be renewed annually, and uniforms or allowances there-
10 for in accordance with law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902), and said
11 amount shall be derived from funds available to the Federal
12 Home Loan Bank Board, including those in the Federal
13 Home Loan Bank Board revolving fund and receipts of the
14 Board for the current fiscal year and prior fiscal years, and
15 the Board may utilize and may make payment for services
16 and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal
17 Reserve banks, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance
18 Corporation, and other agencies of the Government (includ-
19 ing payment for office space) : *Provided*, That all necessary
20 expenses in connection with the conservatorship of institu-
21 tions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance
22 Corporation or activities relating to section 6 (i) of the Fed-
23 eral Home Loan Bank Act, section 5 (d) of the Home Own-
24 ers' Loan Act of 1933, or section 407 or 408 of the National
25 Housing Act and all necessary expenses (including services

1 performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other
2 personal services) in connection with the handling, including
3 the purchase, sale, and exchange, of securities on behalf of
4 Federal home-loan banks, and the sale, issuance, and retire-
5 ment of, or payment of interest on, debentures or bonds, under
6 the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, shall be con-
7 sidered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof:
8 *Provided further*, That members and alternates of the Federal
9 Savings and Loan Advisory Council shall be entitled to reim-
10 bursement from the Board as approved by the Board for
11 transportation expenses incurred in attendance at meetings of
12 or concerned with the work of such Council and may be paid
13 not to exceed \$25 per diem in lieu of subsistence: *Provided*
14 *further*, That expenses of any functions of supervision (ex-
15 cept of Federal home-loan banks) vested in or exercisable
16 by the Board shall be considered as nonadministrative ex-
17 penses: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$1,000 shall be
18 available for official reception and representation expenses:
19 *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provisions
20 of this Act, except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore
21 specified, the administrative expenses and other obligations
22 of the Board shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accord-
23 ance with the provisions of the Federal Home Loan Bank
24 Act of July 22, 1932, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1421-1449):
25 *Provided further*, That the nonadministrative expenses (ex-

cept those included in the first proviso hereof) for the supervision and examination of Federal and State chartered institutions (other than special examinations determined by the Board to be necessary) shall not exceed \$14,396,000.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

Not to exceed \$340,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis and shall be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation, properly capitalized expenditures, expenses in connection with liquidation of insured institutions or activities relating to section 407 or 408 of the National Housing Act, liquidation or handling of assets of or derived from insured institutions, payment of insurance, and action for or toward the avoidance, termination, or minimizing of losses in the case of insured institutions, legal fees and expenses, and payments for expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board determined by said Board to be properly allocable to said Corporation, and said Corporation may utilize and may make payments for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and other agencies of the Government: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the

1 administrative expenses and other obligations of said Cor-
2 poration shall be incurred, allowed and paid in accordance
3 with title IV of the Act of June 27, 1934, as amended (12
4 U.S.C. 1724-1730b).

5 DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN

6 DEVELOPMENT

7 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, HOUSING
8 FOR THE ELDERLY OR HANDICAPPED

9 Not to exceed \$1,272,000 of funds in the revolving fund
10 established pursuant to section 202 of the Housing Act of
11 1959, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701q et seq.), shall be
12 available for administrative expenses.

13 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, COLLEGE
14 HOUSING LOANS

15 Not to exceed \$2,275,000 shall be available for all ad-
16 ministrative expenses of carrying out the program of housing
17 loans to educational institutions (12 U.S.C. 1749-1749d).

18 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, PUBLIC
19 FACILITY LOANS

20 Not to exceed \$1,227,000 of funds in the revolving fund
21 established pursuant to title II of the Housing Amendments
22 of 1955, as amended, shall be available for administrative
23 expenses.

1 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, REVOLVING
2 FUND (LIQUIDATING PROGRAMS)

3 During the current fiscal year not to exceed \$100,000
4 shall be available for administrative expenses, but this amount
5 shall be exclusive of expenses necessary in the case of de-
6 faulted obligations to protect the interests of the Government.

7 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRA-
8 TIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

9 For administrative expenses in carrying out duties im-
10 posed by or pursuant to law, not to exceed \$11,500,000 of
11 the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration
12 shall be available, in accordance with the National Housing
13 Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701) : *Provided*, That funds
14 shall be available for contract actuarial services (not to ex-
15 ceed \$1,500) : *Provided further*, That nonadministrative
16 expenses classified by section 2 of Public Law 387, approved
17 October 25, 1949, shall not exceed \$92,000,000.

18 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL
19 NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

20 Not to exceed \$10,000,000 shall be available for admin-
21 istrative expenses, which shall be on accrual basis, and shall
22 be exclusive of interest paid, expenses (including expenses
23 for fiscal agency services performed on a contract or fee
24 basis) in connection with the issuance and servicing of se-
25 curities, depreciation, properly capitalized expenditures, fees

1 for servicing mortgages, expenses (including services per-
2 formed on a force account, contract or fee basis, but not in-
3 cluding other personal services) in connection with the ac-
4 quisition, protection, operation, maintenance, improvement,
5 or disposition of real or personal property belonging to said
6 Association or in which it has an interest, cost of salaries,
7 wages, travel, and other expenses of persons employed out-
8 side of the continental United States, and all administrative
9 expenses reimbursable from other Government agencies:

10 *Provided*, That the distribution of administrative expenses
11 to the accounts of the Association shall be made in accordance
12 with generally recognized accounting principles and practices.

13 ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, LOW RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

14 Administrative expenses of carrying out the provisions
15 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42
16 U.S.C. 1401-1433) shall be provided for from amounts
17 appropriated therefor in this Act, except that necessary
18 expenses of providing representatives at the sites of non-
19 Federal projects in connection with the construction of such
20 projects by public housing agencies with aid under the
21 United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, shall be
22 compensated by such agencies by the payment of fixed fees
23 which in the aggregate will cover the costs of rendering such
24 services, and expenditures for such purpose shall be con-
25 sidered nonadministrative expenses, and funds received from

1 such payments may be used only for the payment of neces-
2 sary expenses of providing such representatives.

3 TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

4 SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this
5 Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any cor-
6 poration or agency included in this Act, shall be used for
7 publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or de-
8 feat legislation pending before the Congress.

9 SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in
10 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any
11 corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used to
12 pay the compensation of any employee engaged in person-
13 nel work in excess of the number that would be provided
14 by a ratio of one such employee to one hundred and thirty-
15 five, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent
16 employees of the corporation or agency concerned: *Pro-*
17 *vided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be
18 considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half-
19 time or more in personnel administration consisting of direc-
20 tion and administration of the personnel program; employ-
21 ment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classifi-
22 cation; employee relations and services; wage administra-
23 tion; and processing, recording, and reporting.

24 SEC. 303. Appropriations and funds available for the
25 administrative expenses of the Department of Housing and

1 Urban Development shall be available in the current fiscal
2 year for purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as au-
3 thorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902) ; hire of passenger
4 motor vehicles; and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

5 SEC. 304. Funds made available for the Department of
6 Housing and Urban Development under title II of this Act
7 shall be available, without regard to the limitations on admin-
8 istrative expenses, for legal services on a contract or fee
9 basis, and for utilizing and making payment for services and
10 facilities of Federal National Mortgage Association, Fed-
11 eral Reserve banks or any member thereof, Federal home-
12 loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the
13 Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended
14 (12 U.S.C. 1811-1831).

15 SEC. 305. None of the funds provided herein shall be
16 used to pay any recipient of a grant for the conduct of a re-
17 search project an amount equal to as much as the entire cost
18 of such project.

19 SEC. 306. No part of any appropriation contained in this
20 Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the cur-
21 rent fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

22 SEC. 307. None of the funds in this Act shall be avail-
23 able to finance interdepartmental boards, commissions,
24 councils, committees, or similar groups under sec. 214 of the

1 Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1946 (31 U.S.C.
2 691) which do not have prior and specific Congressional
3 approval of such method of financial support.

4 This Act may be cited as the "Independent Offices and
5 Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropria-
6 tion Act, 1969".

A BILL

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee

MAY 3, 1968

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued May 8, 1968
For actions of May 7, 1968
90th-2nd; No. 77

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....3	Farm parity.....27	National Data Center....16
Arts and humanities.....12	Federal aid.....38	Pay raise.....18
Balance of payments..15,23	Foreign trade.....8,25,39	Personnel.....11
Buildings.....7	Forestry.....5	Pollution.....21
Committees.....46	Freight rates.....14	Poultry.....35
Commodity reserves.....6	Grading.....41	Property.....7,42
Consumers.....29,41	Handicapped.....38	Public Law 480.....1
Crop insurance.....28	Holidays.....2	Reclamation.....4,43
Dairy.....22	Honey.....44	School lunch.....22
Data center.....16	Housing.....36	Selective service.....40
East-West trade.....25	Hunger.....20	Social security.....30
Education.....38	Import ceilings.....39	Taxation.....9,33
Eggs.....35	Indemnity payments.....44	Textile imports.....25
Electrification.....24,37	India agriculture.....32	Trade.....8,25,39
Employment.....10,31	Information.....16,17	Urban affairs.....46
Expenditures.....9,23	Inspection.....41	Water.....34
Farm labor.....13	Library.....19	
Farm losses.....33	Livestock.....26	

HIGHLIGHTS: House Rules Committee cleared Public Law 480 bill. Rep. Vigorito introduced and discussed bill to prohibit unauthorized use of "USDA" grade labeling.

HOUSE

1. PUBLIC LAW 480. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 16165, to extend and amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act. p. H3453
2. HOLIDAYS. By a 350-27 vote, agreed to consider H. R. 15951, to provide for certain uniform Monday holidays (pp. H3413-16). This bill is to be debated today, May 8 (p. D401).

3. APPROPRIATIONS. The Rules Committee reported a resolution waiving points of order against H. R. 17023, the independent offices and HUD appropriation bill (p. H3453). This bill is to be debated today, May 8 (p. D401).
4. RECLAMATION. The Rules Committee reported resolutions for consideration of H. R. 3300, to authorize the Colorado River Basin reclamation project, and S. 3033, to increase the authorization for the Missouri River Basin reclamation project. p. H3453
5. FORESTRY. The Judiciary Committee reported with amendment H. R. 3165, for relief of Hood River County, Oreg., in connection with alleged timber trespass arising out of timber sales (H. Rept. 1358). p. H3453
6. COMMODITY RESERVES. Received from this Department a proposed bill to provide for establishment and maintenance of strategic reserve stocks of agricultural commodities by producers and Commodity Credit Corporation for national security public protection, meeting international commitments, etc. To Agriculture Committee. p. H3453
7. BUILDINGS; PROPERTY. The Public Works Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 16981, limiting the use for demonstration purposes of any federally owned property in D. C. (p. D402). Rep. Cramer commended the bill (p. H3433).
8. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Herlong spoke in favor of H. R. 16936, to share domestic markets with imports and let them grow together. pp. H3433-6
9. TAXATION; EXPENDITURES. Rep. Moorhead recommended the compromise proposed by the Ways and Means Committee in connection with the taxation-expenditures bill. p. H3440
10. EMPLOYMENT. Rep. Goodell spoke in favor of H. R. 17028, to strengthen enforcement procedures of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. p. H3442
11. PERSONNEL. Rep. Gross asked that Government employees be prohibited from promoting the poor people's campaign on Government time. pp. H3442-3

SENATE

12. ARTS AND HUMANITIES. Passed as reported H. R. 11308, to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 to authorize funding through fiscal year 1970, and make certain other changes of a technical nature. pp. S5011-6
13. FARM LABOR. Received a farm workers resolution calling for legislation to cover agricultural workers under the Unemployment Act. p. S5041
14. FREIGHT RATES. Sen. Church was added as a cosponsor of S. 3410, to establish an advisory commission to make a study and report with respect to freight rates for farm products. p. S5046

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST THE "NATIONAL
AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION" PRO-
VISIONS OF H.R. 17023

MAY 7, 1968.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H. Res. 1164]

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 1164, reports the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.



House Calendar No. 236

90TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. RES. 1164

[Report No. 1362]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 7, 1968

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution;
which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

RESOLUTION

1 *Resolved*, That during the consideration of the bill
2 (H.R. 17023) making appropriations for sundry inde-
3 pendent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corpora-
4 tions, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and
5 Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30,
6 1969, and for other purposes, all points of order against
7 the provisions contained under the heading "National Aero-
8 nautics and Space Administration" beginning on page 19,
9 line 17, through page 21, line 8, are hereby waived.

90TH CONGRESS
2D Session

H. RES. 1164

[Report No. 1362]

RESOLUTION

Providing for a waiver of points of order
against the "National Aeronautics and Space
Administration" provisions of H.R. 17023.

By Mr. COLMER

MAY 7, 1968

Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be
printed

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
(TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued May 9, 1968
For actions of May 8, 1968
90th-2nd; No. 78

CONTENTS

Alaska.....1,4	Hunger.....21	Poverty.....18
Appropriations.....1	Inter-American	Report.....3
Assessments.....1	Development Bank.....7	Retirement.....19
Commission.....21	Intergovernmental	Roads.....29
Crop insurance.....8	cooperation.....12	Rural life.....14
Electrification.....1,30	Lands.....27	Rural-urban balance....16
Employment.....4,17,24	Manpower.....25	Safety.....28
Expenditures.....2	Molasses.....23	Tariffs.....23
Farm program.....26	OIG.....3	Taxation.....2,10
Fees and charges.....1	Participation sales.....1	Transportation.....6
FHA.....9,14	Personnel.....19	Wilderness.....11,22
Foreign trade...5,13,20,23	Potatoes.....15	

HIGHLIGHTS: Conferees announced agreement to 10-percent income tax surcharge and \$6 billion expenditure reduction. House passed independent offices-HUD appropriation bill. Rep. Poage introduced farm bill. Several Reps. introduced and Reps. Goodell and Fraser discussed bill to establish Commission on Hunger.

HOUSE

APPROPRIATIONS. Passed, 353-37, with amendments H. R. 17023, the independent offices and HUD appropriation bill (pp. H3458-502). This bill includes funds for Office of Emergency Planning, Office of Science and Technology, Appalachian regional development programs, disaster relief, Civil Service Commission, Federal Power Commission, Federal Trade Commission, General Services Administration, Interstate Commerce Commission, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Civil Defense, National Science Foundation, Selective Service System, Veterans Administration, and Department of Housing and Urban Development. Adopted

an amendment by Rep. Broyhill, Va., to deny funds for salaries of Federal employees who participate in or incite a riot (p. H3498). Rejected an amendment by Rep. Fino to reduce the model cities program funds by \$188 million (pp. H3492-4).

Rejected, 173-216, a motion by Rep. Bow to recommit the bill with instructions to limit the total expenditures to \$15,518,483,000. pp. H3500-1

In reporting the bill the Appropriations Committee stated:

Participation certificate sales. "The Committee has reviewed carefully the programs for which participation sales authorizations are proposed and recommends that no additional authorizations be provided in fiscal year 1969. This is a net reduction in new budget (obligational) authority of \$2,085,000,000, including \$515,000,000 for the Veterans Administration and \$1,570,000,000 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

"In examining the budget programs to see how the funds derived from participation sales would be used, the Committee found only one instance, the Housing for the Elderly or Handicapped Fund, where any of the new budget authority would be required for fiscal year 1969 programs. In this instance the Committee recommends an appropriation of \$25,000,000 instead of the sale of participation certificates.

"Prior to 1968 participation certificate sales were not included within the public debt limitation. The participation certificates are included in the 1969 Budget as new obligational authority. As the Congress is empowered to set the limit on the sale of such certificates in appropriation bills, the denial of the authority proposed in the budget this year constitutes a valid reduction in the President's new (obligational) authority requests.

"The reductions in participation sales will not affect fiscal year 1969 expenditures, but will effect substantial reductions in spending in future years."

Fees and charges. "Title V of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952 (5 U.S.C. 140) includes a provision providing for the collection of fees by the Federal government for services rendered. It authorizes each agency head to prescribe a fee or charge for benefits, privileges, authority, use, and other things of value which is determined to be 'fair and equitable taking into consideration direct and indirect cost to the Government, value to the recipient, public policy or interest served....'.

"A number of agencies provided for in this bill collect fees or charges for licenses or services rendered. The Committee is concerned that the Federal government is not receiving sufficient return for all the services which it renders to special beneficiaries. This is particularly noteworthy with respect to the value to the recipient of certificates, franchises and operating permits. For instance, the license fees paid in the multibillion dollar radio and television industry are negligible in comparison to the value of these franchises. Other operating rights granted by agencies and commissions of Government have substantial values to the recipients. Accordingly, the Committee recommends that the applicable agencies review their schedule of fees and charges with a view to making increases or adjustments as may be warranted, taking into consideration beneficial certificates and privileges granted, to offset in part the increasing needs for direct appropriations for operating costs of the agencies concerned."

Electrification. "A request for \$500,000 was included in the budget to initiate a national energy study at the direction of the President. The basic purpose of such a study would be to appraise Government policies and programs for all forms of energy--coal, oil, gas, hydro-electric, and nuclear--which are becoming progressively interchangeable and competitive.

"The Committee recognizes that the Government must be assured that its energy policies are rational and reasonably consistent. Qualified experts on the staff of the Office of Science and Technology and in various departments and agencies of the Government should seek the cooperation of industry to bring together information currently available, and perhaps ^{achieve} most of the goals of the study at substantial savings. Accordingly, funds for ~~this~~ study are denied by the Committee at this time."

Assessments. "Last year the Committee expressed its displeasure with a proposal of the Commission to finance the cost of its interagency board program by reimbursements and charges to agencies and departments instead of by direct appropriation. The Committee recognizes the merits of the program, but is of the opinion that the centralized activities should cost less, not more, than the agency boards replaced. The boards are now funded by direct appropriations. The Committee notes that a number of other activities promoted by the Commission are being financed by charges and reimbursements from agencies and departments. Section 307 of the bill specifically prohibits the use of funds for certain interdepartmental boards, commissions, councils, committees, or similar groups which do not have prior and specific Congressional approval."

2. TAXATION; EXPENDITURES. The "Daily Digest" states that the conferees on H. R. 15414, the tax and expenditure-control bill, "announced that agreement had been reached to impose a 10-percent surcharge on income taxes, and to reduce Federal expenditures by \$6 billion." p. D410
3. OIG. Received a GAO report on a review of activities of the Office of the Inspector General, USDA. p. H3516

SENATE

4. EMPLOYMENT. The Labor and Public Welfare Committee reported an original bill, S. 3465, to further promote equal employment opportunities of American workers (S. Rept. 1111). pp. S5154-5
5. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Percy inserted several editorials analyzing the "critical situation" confronting the U. S. balance of trade. pp. S5165-8
6. TRANSPORTATION. The Commerce Committee reported with amendment H. R. 15190, to amend the act providing for an investigation to determine a site for a sea-level canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans (S. Rept. 1112). p. S5154
Sen. Harris was added as a cosponsor of S. 3410, to establish an advisory commission to make a study and report with respect to freight rates for farm products. p. S5156
7. INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK. The Foreign Relations Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 15364, to provide for increased participation by the U. S. in the Inter-American Development Bank. p. D407

8. CROP INSURANCE. Sen. Nelson praised the Federal crop insurance program in Wis. p. S5162
9. FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION. Sen. Gruening praised FHA's role in the development of rural Alaska. pp. S5162-3
10. TAXATION. Sen. Harris inserted an Okla. Legislature resolution urging the continuation of the tax-exempt status of industrial revenue bonds. p. S5163
Sen. Curtis inserted the minority report of the Municipal Industrial Finance Committee, which details matters that support his amendment to prevent the Treasury Department's ruling to eliminate the tax exemption on industrial-type revenue bonds from taking effect. pp. S5179-80
11. WILDERNESS. Sen. Bayh inserted a speech regarding South American "heartlands," which emphasized that the agricultural, industrial, and commercial development of the U. S. was largely dependent on an inflow of foreign capital. pp. S5180-2
12. INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION. Sen. Muskie inserted amendments intended to be proposed by him to S. 698, the intergovernmental cooperation bill, to encourage simplification and improved coordination of accounting, auditing, and financial reporting requirements of Federal assistance programs. pp. S5156-7

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

13. TRADE. Rep. Curtis inserted a speech by the president of the International Economic Policy Ass'n in which he stated that the U. S. must balance the budget to maintain the value of the dollar, and eliminate other-than-tariff barriers in foreign countries that impede U. S. exports. pp. E3903-5
14. RURAL LIFE; FHA. Sen. McGovern paid tribute to Msgr. Louis Miller as "champion of the American farmer", and inserted an FHA memorandum expressing sorrow at his death. pp. E3906-7
15. POTATOES. Rep. Hathaway stated that the potato diversion and purchase programs established by this Department in Jan. "have accomplished their objectives." p. E3913
16. RURAL-URBAN BALANCE. Rep. Stephens inserted Secretary Freeman's speech before the Ass'n County Commissioners of Ga. "directed toward the problem of rural-urban imbalance and the need for regional planning as a means to resolve this problem." pp. E3915-7
17. EMPLOYMENT. Rep. Scheuer inserted a partial transcript of hearings on the proposed equal employment opportunity bill. pp. E3928-30
Rep. Conyers inserted an analysis of the proposed bill. pp. E3949-61
18. POVERTY. Rep. Ashbrook criticized the poverty program and inserted an article, "How Poverty Program Throws Away Dollars." pp. E3969-71



United States
of America

Please return to
Division of Legislative Reporting
Office of Budget and Finance

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 114

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 8, 1968

No. 78

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Gerald Green, Adath Israel Synagogue, Trenton, N.J., offered the following prayer:

Sovereign of the universe and Father of mankind: In these soul-stirring times we earnestly pray that Thy guidance and Thy blessing will bring forth the best that is within us. We turn to Thee in deepest need seeking wisdom and inspiration for those who are charged with the awesome responsibility of directing the affairs of our Nation.

We ask not that we be relieved of our burdens but that we be given the strength to bear them, not for an end to problems, but for wisdom to understand them, not for an escape from challenges but for courage to face them.

Grant us compassion that embraces all men in the circle of its concerns and that registers upon our heart the anguish of the distressed, the pain of the denied, and the sorrow of the dejected.

Undergird our spirits that we may remain tireless in our efforts, unswerving in our loyalty, and invincible in our hope that a just and peaceful world may speedily be realized, when all citizens of our land will enjoy the freedom to nurture the promise that lies within them, that together we may surge forward to build a stronger nation and a better world in which the divine image Thou hast imprinted upon us may shine forth undimmed.

This we ask in Thy name, our Father in Heaven. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 11308. An act to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 816, 80th Congress, appointed Mr. FANNIN to be a member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy in lieu of Mr. BAKER, resigned:

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 90-259, appointed Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. COTTON, as members on the part of the Senate, to the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control.

COLUMBUS DAY

(Mr. BRINKLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Third Congressional District of Georgia includes the growing city of Columbus which excels in friendly people, harmonious race relations, and a spirit of cooperation and cordiality with its military neighbor, Fort Benning. In tribute to the excellence of this city, I rise in favor of H.R. 15951, which, among other things, would establish Columbus Day as a national holiday.

Christopher Columbus was a great explorer who exemplified the high standards of self-reliance which has made this Nation great and it would be most fitting to establish Columbus Day as a national holiday.

Our city of Columbus, Ga., has for many years participated in the observance of Columbus Day and I know that favorable consideration of this feature would be a splendid, nationwide reminder of the qualities of a great man. It would also serve to motivate us toward new horizons with the same faith that piloted him.

CITIZEN RESPONSIBILITY DISPLAYED IN ELECTIONS

(Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, of all the election results reported from all sections

of our country from yesterday's voting, I selfishly had greater interest in just one. It was conducted in the largest community of Michigan's Eighth District which I am proud to represent in Congress.

I am even more proud of the citizen responsibility that was displayed as residents of the city of Saginaw overwhelmingly approved a new city ordinance on open housing.

The unofficial vote tabulation was 11,666 "yes" votes and only 5,214 in opposition. To my knowledge, the city of Saginaw becomes the fourth community in our State of Michigan to approve, by vote an open housing ordinance pretty well patterned after the legislation included in the civil rights law of 1968 recently enacted by the Congress.

I would also point out, Mr. Speaker, that the city of Saginaw has a population of nearly 100,000, including approximately 20 percent Negro. It is an industrial city with nearly 20 major plants including a number of General Motors Corp. factories.

To illustrate citywide support of the measure, I have been informed that the open housing issue was approved in 40 of the city's 42 voting precincts. In the remaining two precincts, it lost by only one vote in one precinct and by 28 in the other.

As I mentioned earlier, there perhaps was more glamour and more attention focused on other election contests yesterday, but none shone more brightly or carried greater impact than what was accomplished by Saginaw voters yesterday.

(Mr. HARSNA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. HARSHA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

(Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend

his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

MAY 13 CUTOFF IN THE FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM BECAUSE OF FAILURE TO ACT ON \$400 MILLION SUPPLEMENTAL MEANS FORCED CUT OF \$1 BILLION

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, we have presently in existence another example of fiscal mismanagement of the highway trust fund. The Department of Transportation advised all States yesterday that there will be no further matching funds for highways after May 13 during this fiscal year of 1968 unless Congress acts on a supplemental appropriation of \$400 million which was sent up last year. When the overall supplemental appropriation bill was under consideration early this year it was withdrawn by the administration and there is no overall supplemental appropriation bill available to carry this supplemental through by May 13 and, therefore, the program is \$400 million behind, in addition to the \$600 million cut by Presidential fiat only a few months ago.

This is another example of the administration giving little leadership or foresight in this field and is another indication of fiscal management in our highway program relating to the highway trust fund which is still suffering from the \$600 million cutback.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Committee on Appropriations will find a way to unravel this matter despite the lack of leadership on the part of the administration.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD of yesterday, May 7, be corrected as follows:

On page H3428, in the second column, the second paragraph, my remarks should read:

I believe with all the facts that have been developed and with the sense of urgency that is before us that study can be done and should be done within a period of 18 months.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 121]

Adair	Gettys	Miller, Calif.
Andrews, Ala.	Gibbons	Moore
Ashmore	Green, Oreg.	Morse, Mass.
Bevill	Hagan	Nichols
Carter	Halleck	O'Hara, Ill.
Corman	Hansen, Idaho	Olsen
Cunningham	Hardy	Pool
Davis, Ga.	Hathaway	Pucinski
Diggs	Hawkins	Resnick
Dowdy	Hays	Roush
Edwards, Ala.	Henderson	Ruppe
Edwards, La.	Holland	Selden
Ellberg	Jacobs	Steed
Feighan	Kirwan	Watts
Flood	Landrum	Wyatt
Frelinghuysen	MacGregor	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 384 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

A REVOLTING ACT OF DESECRATION

(Mr. JOELSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to read that recently some warped person or persons took down the American flag which flies over the Marine Memorial in Arlington, and hoisted in its place the flag of the Vietcong. As my colleagues know, this monument is the famous and inspiring work which has immortalized the valor of our Marines at Iwo Jima.

In order to protect this statue against vandals in the future and also to accord it the respect and honor to which it is entitled, I have introduced a measure to have a Marine honor guard placed at the monument on a 24-hour basis.

Mr. Speaker, it is unbelievable that any American would stoop so low as to place the Vietcong flag over a monument which marks a moment of triumph of a free nation over totalitarian forces. Those who revel in dissent and dissension would be the very first to have their voices stifled if the Communists were in control. For we see daily evidences of the fact that in a communistic society, those who criticize the establishment are clamped into prison and sentenced to grinding labor, if not summarily murdered.

For my part, I shall continue to support programs to keep America free and democratic so that those who yearn for Communist victories are protected against their own stupidity and folly. And I hope that as an indication of our belief in democracy and as a symbol of our gratitude to those who have given so much to protect freedom, the Iwo Jima monument will be guarded with respect, dignity, and honor.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the permanent bound CONGRESSIONAL RECORD be corrected as follows:

On March 28, 1968, at page H2354 during my remarks the bill to which I referred is erroneously listed as "H.R. 16265" in three instances. It should be

corrected to read "H.R. 16266" in each instance.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

GEN. ROBERT E. WOOD NAMED SEARS' HONORARY CHAIRMAN

(Mr. McCCLORY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, today marks another great milestone in the brilliant career of my friend and constituent, Gen. Robert E. Wood—U.S. Army, retired—of Lake Forest, Ill.

General Wood has made numerous contributions to the civic military, economic, cultural, educational, social, and spiritual values of this nation. I have commented before on some of these contributions.

Today, in Chicago, Sears, Roebuck & Co. is paying tribute to General Wood in appreciation of his 44 years of active association with that company. At this ceremony, General Wood will be named as the company's first honorary chairman.

General Wood, who will attain his 89th birthday on June 13, will be present at the luncheon, where numerous civic and public leaders will join his associates at Sears in honoring him.

I am confident that his many friends in this House of Representatives will want to join me in extending to Gen. Robert E. Wood our heartfelt congratulations and deep appreciation for the many benefits which have been derived from his career of service to the Nation and to the world.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1969

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 1164 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1164

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17023) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, all points of order against the provisions contained under the heading "National Aeronautics and Space Administration" beginning on page 19, line 17, through page 21, line 8, are hereby waived.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California, and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, this rule is reported for the simple reason that certain provisions of the appropriation bill which will presently be under consideration have not been acted upon by the other body and, therefore, would be subject to a point of order. Otherwise, of course, a rule would not be necessary since the Committee on Appropriations has the privilege of filing its report directly.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not go into any details with reference to the bill.

I now shall be glad to yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding. Is this the second consecutive year that we have had some difficulty with the NASA appropriation bill with respect to the NASA authorization bill?

Mr. COLMER. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that my memory of that is very hazy. But I will accept that as a fact.

Also, I would like to add that one of the reasons for the granting of this rule by the Committee on Rules was to hasten the consideration of this bill. It is my opinion that the spirit of this House is pretty largely in favor of the fact that we should expedite bills now pending in the Congress as much as possible, particularly the money bills in order that we can get this Congress adjourned at least insofar as the House of Representatives is concerned without having to come back here after the conventions of the two major parties, the Democratic Party and the Republican Party.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, as one Member of this House I am very happy to cooperate toward that end.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COLMER. I will be glad to yield further to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. That is one of the most optimistic statements that I have heard in a good many weeks, and even months, with respect to the conduct of the business of the House. I sincerely hope the gentleman is right; that we are going to get out of here about the first of August, and that would have to be the time if we are going to adjourn sine die for the national conventions.

I hope the gentleman is right. I hope his optimism is sustained, but somehow or other I am a good deal more pessimistic on that score than the gentleman.

Mr. COLMER. In reply to that I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa that one never knows unless one tries, and certainly unless we try we will not get out of here by the first of August.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, I want to say to my friend from Mississippi that I do

not like to see rules waiving points of order on appropriation bills, any portion of any bill. It is my understanding that this is limited to the NASA appropriation provisions of the bill.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman is correct. I might add also for the information of the gentleman—and of the Members of the House—that the Committee on Rules has recently adopted a course of procedure where these rules waiving points of order will be limited to specific items, as has been done in this instance.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate that statement very much. I was not aware that the Committee on Rules had adopted that policy. I want to commend the Committee on Rules.

At the same time I must protest appropriation bills coming to the House floor with points of order waived under any circumstances. I just do not believe it is good procedure, and I must protest it.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. COLMER. I might say further to my friend from Iowa that I have never liked the idea of waiving points of order, but there are occasions where I believe it is justified, and I believe in this particular instance it is justified.

While I am on that subject I would like to add that there is a very strong feeling in the Committee on Rules that that committee, somewhat controlling the flow of legislation to the floor of the House, should place a cutoff date and so notify the various chairmen of the various committees of the House that if they want their bills considered they must be in by a fixed date. That opinion is very strong in our committee, and I certainly hope that we may have the cooperation of all Members of the House, and of course of our distinguished leadership, in bringing that about. I want to add to that what I have stated previously on this floor, and that is that if this Congress does not adjourn sine die before these conventions that we will be coming back here after the conventions, possibly around Labor Day, and we will be harangued with political speeches for the rest of the year. And I do not believe that is conducive to good legislation, and I do not believe it is for the best interests of the membership of this House, all of whom, or most of whom, will have opposition in the general elections, and will have no opportunity to visit with their people, and to acquaint their people with their viewpoints and justify their position in this Congress.

I appreciate the contribution of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. I want to join with the gentleman from Iowa in saying that I had hoped the Committee on Rules would not grant a rule waiving points of order here.

There were two agencies that appeared before the Independent Office Subcommittee whose appropriations would have been subject to a point of order because the legislation had not passed the Congress yet. One is the space agency and the other was the housing and urban

development agency. A point of order would have been appropriate to be made against both of them. However, the rule was requested only with respect to the space agency, leaving for sometime in the future the appropriations for the new year for the housing agency. I think it unfortunate. In view of the gentleman's argument that he favors accelerating and expediting the business of the House, including these appropriations, and appropriation for the housing agency as well might have been made.

Mr. COLMER. I appreciate the gentleman's observation.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. In response to the comment made by the gentleman from Illinois, I think it is well to point out that there is a difference in the two cases that he cited.

The NASA authorization bill has already been approved by the House of Representatives and is pending in the other body.

The authorization to which he refers for the Department of Housing, Urban and Development has not even cleared the committee.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. May I say to the gentleman, I am told the other body will consider the House bill next week and it will therefore be almost in the same position that the NASA agency would be.

Mr. JONAS. If I may respond to that, it may be in "almost" the same position but it is not in the same position; and we cannot operate in the committee on the basis of the information of the gentleman from Illinois—we can only operate on the information that we have before us. We have no justification for these items.

Mr. COLMER. If I may respond to both gentlemen very briefly, I am sure they are both in accord with my observations that if we do not take some action, some positive affirmative action here to adjourn this Congress, we could well be here until after the snow flies and that would not be in the best interests of the country.

We always have to wait on those people over there. I have no desire to chastise them or to cast any aspersions upon them. But it is the fact that we do have to await their pleasure on these matters and this might be a little incentive for them to go forward on this.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that the gentleman from Mississippi has explained the situation very adequately, thoroughly, and ably. I concur in the remarks that he has made and associate myself with them, and particularly as to the statement he made relative to our desire to adjourn.

On this side of the aisle, I will say that we will cooperate in every way that we possibly can in the Committee on Rules to give everybody a chance to be heard on their bill.

I hope we can get out of here by the first of August, and not return. I urge the adoption of this resolution, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to speak out of the regular order.)

MR. PRESIDENT, STOP THE VIOLENCE

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, there was another murder in Washington yesterday, during a store robbery, and nine new cases of arson. That was the third murder within a week of a storeworker, and arson is so frequent it is impossible to keep a count. The President should immediately intervene in the Washington crime situation, since the city government he appointed continues to refuse to meet the problem with force.

The government of the District of Columbia was reorganized by the President himself, and he appointed the Mayor and each member of the City Council. That government, and the men appointed to run it, have now proven themselves insufficient to the task of preserving law and order.

Under Mayor Washington, Mr. Murphy was appointed Public Safety Director. Mr. Murphy has restricted police action to such an extent that law and order has all but collapsed in the city. Mr. Murphy assured everyone, far and wide, that he would be prepared for any eventuality, and could insure the safety of the city, but he did not expect any trouble.

After all, as Edwin Lahey of the Knight newspapers pointed out recently, "the 200 million Americans who own the District of Columbia have been generous to the three-quarter million who reside here—on a per capita basis, the District of Columbia received about twice its share" of Federal grants.

It took 14,000 U.S. troops to restore order after Mr. Murphy had restricted the local police. There were errors in judgment. There were communications failures. There was confusion. And there was death, fire, and destruction.

Information is now coming to light, however, that the crime rate in Washington was spiraling even prior to the riot.

As early as 11 months ago, District of Columbia Bank Association President McLachlen said in a Washington speech:

It is the shame of our nation that in its capital city its citizens are afraid to open their business doors or even to take a walk. In human terms and in terms of our area's economy, this cost of crime in Washington today is too high, and it is still very much on the increase.

That was a year ago.

And we have witnessed the tragic breakdown of law and order since the riot. Now it is spilling over into the suburbs, with the criminal element from the inner city crossing over into the outlying areas, then escaping back into Washington where they feel safe.

In spite of all of the efforts of concerned citizens, merchant groups, and Members of the Congress, Mayor Washington has still made no public statement or taken a single action which would indicate an intention on his part to put a stop to this criminal activity by whatever force is necessary. And Mr. Murphy continues to draw his salary, apparently content with sending a few additional policemen into the streets with their hands tied behind their backs by his restrictions on their use of necessary force.

Mr. President, this lawlessness has gone on too long. You appointed Mr. Washington and the City Council. You reorganized the city government. You are commander of the District of Columbia National Guard. It is time you take control of this situation.

A President who takes pride in great social legislation enacted during his tenure in public office, and a President who has worked long and hard to restore peace in the world, cannot sit by while his Nation's Capital is destroyed by arsonists, murderers, and looters.

This city belongs to the Nation. It is the Capital of all our people. Our President is President of all the people. He has an obligation to all of them today. He has an obligation to see that the laws are enforced in the District of Columbia, and that order is restored—now.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is the so-called Safety Director Murphy the same Murphy who was fired by the city of Syracuse, N.Y., and then brought to Washington, D.C., by the so-called Mayor Washington to head up the Police Department and to make of the Chief of Police a figurehead in the Police Department of the District of Columbia? Is this the same Murphy?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I understand he did come from New York. But I do hope that some steps will be taken. It is an absurd situation that the citizens in this city are afraid to walk even on the streets of the Nation's Capital. The President must take some action, because we are getting action from nowhere else within the city of the District of Columbia. If the President does not, this Congress ought to take away the police powers of the District of Columbia and put the Army in here to establish law and order in this city, the Nation's Capital.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I share the concern expressed by the distinguished gentlemen from Florida over the urgent necessity of achieving, preserving, and maintaining law and order in the Nation's Capital. The extent of crisis proportion in the District of Columbia is reflected in the full-page, paid advertisement appearing in yesterday's Washington Post by the Washington, D.C., Retail Liquor Dealers Association, Inc.

It is shocking that such an advertisement should be felt to be necessary to try bring to the attention of those in law enforcement in the executive branch the message that they are not doing their job, and they are not. The people are aroused. They want firmness. Law-abid-

ing citizens demand protection of their persons and their property.

They are entitled to these basic protections. If the present officials fail them, they should be removed and replaced with officials who will protect our people.

This was the advertisement to which I have referred:

BEN BROWN IS DEAD

Brown, Benjamin: On Tuesday, April 30, 1968, Benjamin Brown of 1900 Lyttonsville rd., Silver Spring, Md., beloved husband of Freda Brown; devoted father of Miss Barbara Brown of Silver Spring, Md. Also survived by two sisters, Mrs. Faye Blanken and Mrs. Mollie Cohen, both of Silver Spring, Md. Services at the C. D. Goldberg & Son Funeral Home, 4217 9th st. nw., on Thursday, May 2, at 2 p.m. Interment B'nai Israel Cemetery. In mourning at 1900 Lyttonsville rd., Silver Spring, Md., Apt. 1106. Family suggests in lieu of flowers contributions be made to the Steven Jay Brown Memorial at the Jewish Foundation for Retarded Children, 6200 2d St. nw.

IS LAW ENFORCEMENT ALSO DEAD?

Mr. Brown was shot while defending his property.

Should anarchy prevail because a small segment of the population takes the law into its own hands? Should bands of hoodlums be allowed to continue preying on law-abiding citizens, Negro and white?

When hoodlums—regardless of age, sex or color—are undeterred by the prospect of effective law-enforcement, no one is safe. If criminals can loot, burn and kill in the Inner City without fear of consequences, it is only a question of time before you, your family and your business can feel the effect. It makes no difference where you live, work or play: When law enforcement ceases, disrespect for law is encouraged.

When you walk or drive through many areas of Washington, do you feel safe—or scared? Do you encourage your friends and relatives to visit the Nation's Capitol at this time?

Is the battle over? Not for the citizens whose lives are threatened. Not for the businessmen who cannot rebuild because they cannot get insurance. Not for the few who have surmounted the obstacles of arson and looting, and have reopened only to face new threats of extortion and worse. Not for the people who are out of jobs. Not for the people who were burned out of their homes.

Who is at fault? Certainly not the majority of citizens, white or Negro. Certainly not the majority of the poor, Negro or white. Certainly not the policeman on the beat, who must obey orders.

This is no revolt of youth against older generations. This is no revolt of the poor against the wealthy. This is no part of the Civil Rights movement whose real leaders know that Utopia doesn't have to be built on ashes.

It is an open attack by a few criminals against a community that lacks firm leadership and the courage to demand that its leaders exercise their authority—or resign.

We believe that law enforcement suffers when the police are handcuffed instead of the criminals. We believe that citizens are entitled to protection and safety.

Where is the safety, Mr. Murphy? Where is the protection, Mr. Murphy? Where will tragedy strike next? Today, the Inner City. Tomorrow, the residential areas, the suburbs.

Today, Ben Brown. Tomorrow???

Published because some of us have lost our lives, many of us have lost our property, and all of us want to preserve law and order for all residents of the Washington area and for the United States we love.

WASHINGTON, D.C., RETAIL LIQUOR DEALERS ASSOCIATION, INC.

Mr. Speaker, there is another avenue of available action that should be taken. I refer to H.R. 16981 of which I am a co-sponsor, reported favorably to the Rules Committee by the House Public Works Committee yesterday. It prohibits the granting of a permit for construction of shanties or structures on public property of the District of Columbia west of the Anacostia River. It prohibits this to anyone or any group, whether for the purpose of a scout jamboree or a demonstration—and rightfully so. The bill further provides that in those over circumstances where an assemblage requires a permit that it shall be granted only upon the contention that the applicant also post a reasonable bond to indemnify the Government for any damage to public property that may be involved.

This bill is before the Rules Committee at his hour. It should be reported and passed this week. This is a matter of the most vital importance to the preservation of law and order in the National Capital. It is one of the constructive steps we can take, and I urge such forehanded action now without delay.

LAW AND ORDER IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. RANDALL was allowed to speak out of order.)

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Florida.

In connection with my bill H.R. 16862 which will require persons holding demonstrations on Federal property to post a bond to cover certain costs of such demonstrations and to cover damages to public buildings and restoration of park lands, I concluded it was necessary to write to Mayor Washington, or perhaps the correct title is Commissioner Washington, also to Chief of the Metropolitan Police John B. Layton, Corporation Counsel Charles T. Duncan as well as Hon. Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior. It has been 10 days since I wrote letters to each asking of these gentlemen some of the very things the gentleman from Florida has been speaking about. Among the questions I asked were whether there were any new plans or procedures to protect the citizens in the pursuit of their business during the proposed occupancy of Washington. I inquired whether there were plans to handle the announced tactic of forming human chains to block the river bridges and the freeway tunnels.

Among other questions I asked was whether they are going to have enough police, or troops to guard the firefighters trying to control fires.

We also asked whether the policy followed during the rioting early in April when law enforcement officers ignored looters who walked away with property that did not belong to them in violation of the Criminal Statutes of the District of Columbia, was the present policy and would be adopted as the procedure to be followed during the proposed march on Washington?

These remarks may not be a significant contribution to the thoughts of the gentleman from Florida, but I wanted

the Members of the House to know the content of the questions which had been asked of the principal law enforcement officers of the District of Columbia and of the fact that after the passage of 10 days no reply has been received.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HALEY was allowed to speak out of order.)

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS], in the remarks he has made. This is a deplorable situation we have in the District of Columbia, as well as in some other parts of the Nation.

While I do not think the President of the United States is any more to blame than a lot of other people, I think the Attorney General of the United States has the power and the right to enforce the law, but, in my humble opinion, when it comes to finding the criminal, I do not believe he could find a white elephant on a junior league American baseball diamond.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17023) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 3 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 17023, with Mr. O'HARA of Michigan in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] will be recognized for 1½ hours and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we are bringing you

today a most important and significant bill—the independent offices and Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill for fiscal 1969.

This is a big bill—a significant bill—a fear-reaching, forward-looking bill that touches the lives of all of our people.

I commend to you the reading of our report on this bill which is the product of more than 3 months of intensive work. Our committee held extensive hearings on every phase and facet of this bill, Mr. Chairman.

The hearings consume 3,508 pages in three volumes.

The committee heard 427 witnesses and carefully considered their testimony and recommendations.

Every member of our subcommittee and our capable and competent subcommittee staff contributed to this important measure.

At the outset I want to commend the hard work of all of our members—I refer to my colleagues, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHIPLEY], the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GAIAMO], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MARSH], the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR]; the ranking minority member of our subcommittee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL], the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN], and the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT].

Certainly it was a pleasure to work with my able and distinguished colleague, the ranking minority member on our committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

I also want to commend Mr. Homer Skarin and Mr. Tom Kingfield, our able staff members, who contributed so much time and talent to the preparation of this bill before you today. They worked long and hard to keep the committee advised and informed—and to implement the committee's decisions with respect to the drafting of the bill.

I want to point out also, Mr. Speaker, that this bill embraces new budget concepts contained in the President's commission on Budget Concepts. In line with these concepts this bill presents the effects of the committee's recommendations in terms of new budget, obligatory, authority.

GENERAL SUMMARY

Mr. Chairman, by way of summary: the committee considered budget estimates totaling \$16,570,580,300 for some 20 executive agencies, commissions and offices—and the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The committee has made substantial reductions in the budget recommendation—cuts and reductions totaling \$2,899,944,300.

This is a 17.5 percent reduction—the highest percentage of reduction in the history of our subcommittee insofar as we can determine.

This bill carries an appropriation totaling \$13,670,636,000. This—I repeat—reflects cuts and reductions totaling \$2,899,000,000—almost \$3 billion. This is

\$4,290,683,650 less than the amount for the current year.

The committee considered some 91 items of appropriation—and made limitation and reductions in 70 instances.

In some instances entire amounts recommended were deleted.

In other instances, the requested amounts were substantially reduced.

In a few instances the committee has approved the budgeted amount.

In no instance has the budget estimate been increased.

The cuts we have made totaling \$2,899,944,000 represent a cutback of \$789,944,000 in new appropriations requested in the budget.

These reductions also include \$2,110,000,000 in proposed new funding through the sale of participation certificates. As you know, Congress is empowered to set the limitations on the amount of participation certificates that can be marketed.

Amounts under the new budget concept are considered a part of the budget for obligational authority.

Sales of \$1,570,000,000 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and \$515 million for the Veterans' Administration were proposed in budget requests.

HUD and VA both have substantial carryover balances for participation sales certificate authority. This additional authority is not required at this time.

The committee therefore is not recommending that any further authority be granted for participation sales for 1969. This will not affect or curtail programs of either the Department of Housing and Urban Development or the Veterans' Administration.

We did approve one item the budget recommended for financing through participation sales, but we made a transfer to direct appropriations funding. This was a \$25 million request for housing for the elderly and handicapped. We recommend a direct appropriation of \$25 million to provide this needed funding for the handicapped and elderly.

Mr. Chairman, we recognize that the Congress is confronted with a difficult budgetary situation.

We have had to make some difficult choices.

We want to provide all necessary support for our forces in Vietnam.

At the same time, we want to solve such domestic problems as the crisis of our cities.

We also recognize that we are confronted with a monetary crisis at home and abroad.

All of these factors have been weighed carefully in considering this appropriations bill.

We have done our best to achieve an equitable balance between the necessity for economy and the necessity of fulfilling our responsibilities with respect to domestic problems.

We have made substantial cuts and reductions.

We have deferred items which we felt should be deferred.

We have funded programs which we felt should be funded as necessary at this time.

We have deferred appropriations for unauthorized programs.

We are proceeding to recommend appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration on which the House has acted.

Time will not permit a detailed discussion of all the items contained in the bill, Mr. Chairman. I would hope that every Member would read our report carefully. We, of course, stand ready to give every Member any and all information needed on the bill.

I would like to highlight some of the larger items in this appropriations measure.

The regulatory agencies are funded at essentially the same level as last fiscal year.

FOR GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

The committee considered budget estimates totaling \$509,291,300 for the General Services Administration.

The committee is recommending an appropriation of \$494,813,000.

This reflects a total cut and reduction of \$64,671,900 below the level of funding for the current year.

This represents a reduction of \$14,478,300 less than the budget requested.

There are no new public building construction projects funded in this appropriation.

We have approved the budget estimate of \$10,995,000 for sites and planning for seven projects and increases for four others where additional funding is required. This will permit GSA to continue planning on a minimal basis—to keep the motor idling for an acceleration as conditions permit.

GSA will, of course, continue its important services to the Government. These services include the Public Buildings Service—the Federal Supply Service—the National Archives and Record Service—the Transportation and Communications Service—and the Property Management and Disposal Service, among others.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The committee considered a budget request of \$500 million for the National Science Foundation.

We recommend an appropriation of \$400 million.

This represents a substantial cut of \$100 million.

While this is a large reduction it certainly does not indicate any lack of interest in science and research by our committee.

National Science Foundation has a carryover balance of \$46,500,000—and has an unexpended balance of some \$650 million. Much of this \$650 million, however, is allocated to projects and commitments extended over a period of time.

The committee recognizes the competence and dedication of the Director and members of the National Science Board and recommends that they make the necessary contractual adjustments in the institutional and fellowship grants programs to effectuate the economies proposed.

The committee recognizes the importance of the work of the National Science Foundation on a long-range basis—but

we also recognize the necessity of setting immediate priorities in view of our stringent budgetary situation.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

The committee considered budget requests of \$213,600,000 for the programs of the Appalachian Regional Development program.

The committee recommends a cut and reduction of \$45 million.

We recommend \$168,600,000 to finance this program for fiscal 1969.

The Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 embraces 13 States, 397 counties, and nearly one-tenth of the population of the United States.

The average annual income of the Appalachian area is estimated to be 24 percent below the national average.

Certainly we should provide appropriations to assist our cities in the solution of their problems of poverty and unemployment.

But we must also provide funding to assist this great Appalachian region in combating rural poverty and unemployment. We must help Appalachia develop its resources and provide opportunities for its people.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

The committee considered budget estimates totaling \$4,370,400,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

We are recommending an appropriation of \$4,008,223,000 for NASA for fiscal 1969.

This represents a billion-dollar slash in funding from fiscal 1967—a cut and reduction of \$959,777,000 below the 1967 funding level.

We made a \$580,677,000 cut below 1968. We have made a further cut of \$362,177,000 below the budget for next year.

Appropriations for these programs of space exploration and the development of this needed technology have been on a declining curve for several years. Several years ago the agency was funded at about \$6 billion. Later the funding dropped to \$5½ billion and then \$5 billion. Last year the space budget was cut to \$4½ billion. This year we are recommending continuing the space program at a \$4 billion level.

Annual funding has thus dropped from \$6 billion to \$4 billion in a period of the last few years.

Certainly we have made great progress in our programs of space exploration. We have dramatized our scientific leadership in many areas. We have demonstrated to the world that we can come from behind and hold our own in the scientific area.

During the space decade, we have launched more vehicles—traveled more miles—and achieved more time in space than any other nation in the world.

Our achievements in space are outstanding.

The committee commends the Administrator—our astronauts—and the great scientific and space team for their competence.

The Nation is proud of its space team.

However, because of our stringent budgetary situation we are recommending a hard-rock space budget.

The funding provided in this bill will continue the space program at a reduced level but we can achieve our objectives.

All three areas of space funding—research and development, construction, and administrative operations—are reduced and cut back.

This cut in the NASA budget reflects the current budgetary situation. NASA should have flexibility in allocating and reprogramming the funds that are made available so as to best absorb the substantial cuts that are made necessary at this time.

Formerly 420,000 persons were employed in the space program in every State in the Nation.

Space employment has now dropped to 243,000—appropriations reductions have cut employment in half. Most of these employees work for NASA contractors.

There is a report that an amendment will be offered to further reduce appropriations for the space program.

We do not feel that the funding for NASA can be reduced further without compromising safety.

We do not feel that further reductions can be made without endangering or wrecking the programs.

The committee considers it important that our space team—the finest in the world—be continued and retained intact as far as possible.

We trust that no further cuts will be made—and that you will sustain the committee in the recommendations we are making in this bill.

THE CRISIS OF OUR CITIES

Mr. Chairman, it should not be necessary to emphasize the crisis of our cities.

The fact that our cities are in a crisis is an overpowering fact of life in our Nation today.

We are all concerned—we are all disturbed—we all want to see these basic problems solved.

A year ago during our discussion of the appropriations for HUD for this fiscal year, I stood in this same spot and warned that the Nation is facing the third great crisis in its history.

Our first great crisis was the Civil War.

Our second great crisis was the Great Depression of the 1930's.

And now we face the Nation's third great crisis—the crisis of our cities.

ARCHSTONE OF OUR CIVILIZATION

Our cities are the archstone of our Nation. If the archstone is unsteady and unstable the entire structure is endangered—and our cherished American way of life is challenged and endangered.

This bill is a step in the right direction.

It will help provide a partial solution to the problems of our cities.

Aristotle said that the purpose of a city is to make man happy and safe.

Nine thousand years before Christ, man moved from the field to the city to seek safety and mutual security—but today, in modern America, many Americans have fled the city in search of safety and security. And others are leaving.

This is a sad and shocking commentary on our time and our day in history.

Civilization began when man began to feel safe and secure in his cities and turned to areas of personal achievement and fulfillment.

In the safety of the city, man's creativity and diversity and talents flourished, civilization evolved into the great metropolitan cities of today—and into the crisis that unprecedented growth has created.

Our cities once again must become stable and secure centers of growth where law and order prevails—where people can work together without fear—where people can live together and prosper together—without the specter of violence haunting their days and nights.

The torch of the rioter must be put out and the torch of progress must be held high.

We must move forward through the cooperation and good will of all Americans, within a framework of law and order.

THE NEED IS APPARENT

I want to make it clear that in recommending this appropriations bill for our cities we legislate not from fear but because of concern and commitment.

We are recommending this bill with its generous appropriations for our cities because our cities are jammed with people and crammed with problems.

Congress has responded. We have passed much legislation dealing with the problems of our cities—large and small.

We cannot do the job alone but Congress must continue to provide stimulus and leadership.

We must continue to coordinate and stimulate the combined efforts of Government at all levels—of private enterprise—and, most important, of people themselves.

There must be cooperation between our people if we are to succeed in rebuilding our cities.

The basic thrust to achieve the cooperation and our goals and objectives must come from local leadership and from the people themselves.

Congress has acted decisively and substantially to help solve the problems that plague our cities.

The problems of—

Slums and substandard housing.

Crime and violence.

Poverty and ignorance and disease.

High unemployment in certain areas and groups.

The pollution of our air and water.

The traffic congestion that threatens to congeal transportation.

The exodus of leadership and taxpayers to the suburbs.

The erosion of the community spirit—the spirit of cooperation and mutual trust—that is the foundation of the democratic way of life.

Respect for law and order as the basis upon which all of our problems must be solved.

Congress has placed on the books legislation to combat poverty—to provide employment—to build better housing—to provide good schools and instruction—to curb the pollution of our air and streams—to ease the traffic congestion—

and to encourage people to work and plan together in their communities.

Congress has created the Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development which is charged with the responsibilities of planning, assisting, and helping our cities with problems of inadequate and substandard housing—and the other traditional enemies of mankind in our cities.

HUD is working hard at this job and Congress is doing its part.

The President, in his special message to the Congress on the crisis of our cities, pointed out that his recommended budget includes funds totaling more than \$22 billion for assistance to our cities through more than 100 programs.

A special analysis of the budget puts Federal expenditures in this area at \$37 billion—more than twice the level of 1961.

Since 1957 Congress has appropriated more than \$4½ billion for urban renewal alone in the war on blight and slums.

Since 1959 appropriations for public housing to provide decent homes for poor people have totaled \$1.8 billion.

The open-space land program—enacted in 1962—has channeled more than a quarter of a billion dollars into our cities to assist in the establishment of parks.

The popular water and sewer grant program—enacted in 1966—has been funded to a total of \$365 million—including \$150 million for the current fiscal year.

Last year Congress appropriated \$1,663,000,000 for the war on poverty—and much of this is being spent in our cities and metropolitan areas where 70 percent of our people now live.

CALLS FOR MASSIVE PROGRAMS

The President in an earlier message to Congress this year on our cities recommended the construction of 26 million new homes and apartments over the next decade—including units for 1 million people next fiscal year—6 million per year for 10 years.

The President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders called for a "massive and sustained commitment"—including 600,000 housing units next year.

A Senate Subcommittee on Urban Problems—the Ribicoff committee—called for a \$500 billion expenditure in our cities over a 10-year period.

Governor Rockefeller recently estimated the needs of our cities exceed \$150 billion, and Mayor Lindsay of New York said it would take \$50 billion in New York City alone over the next 10 years to solve that great city's problems.

Mayor Cavanaugh of Detroit recently called for a \$250 billion urban development fund for cities.

There is a great clamor for massive Federal expenditures and Federal appropriations—but I would point out that the Federal Government—as important as its role is in this area—cannot resolve these problems alone.

There must be a commitment—a broad-based commitment—a commit-

ment that includes business, industry, labor, as well as assistance from the Federal Government and from government at all levels, if these problems are to be solved.

What I am trying to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, is that the Federal Government has passed much legislation in this field.

We have provided billions in appropriations—but commitments from other sectors of our economy and our society are required and absolutely essential if we are to get the job done.

CAUGHT IN A SQUEEZE

The Nation, as we all recognize, is caught in a financial squeeze—between the agony of our cities and the ordeal in Vietnam.

Our committee has carefully considered and weighed our commitment in Vietnam—our commitments at home—and our fiscal and monetary situation.

While providing a generous appropriation for HUD—for our cities—we have also made some substantial cuts and reductions in this bill.

The problems of centuries cannot be cured overnight.

The solution of these complex problems will take time and a national commitment by all sectors of our economy.

The private sector of our economy must apply the great technology and techniques of our time to the problems of our cities—and many leaders of business and industry are moving ahead with programs of their own or in cooperation with the Federal Government.

The insurance industry, as we know, has committed a billion dollars to providing housing in slum and ghetto areas of our cities. Private foundations and other groups are helping with commitments.

I commend these captains of commerce and industry.

I commend their initiative and their leadership.

As President Johnson said in his message on cities:

The Government's concern is to stimulate private energy and local action—to provide capital where needed, to guarantee financing, to offer assistance that encourages planning and construction.

A big job belongs to the private sector—the homebuilders, the mortgage banker, the contractor, the nonprofit sponsor, the industrialist who now sees in the challenge the solution to the problems of our cities—large and small—requires this kind of cooperation and commitment.

IMPORTANCE OF SMALL TOWNS

In my view the growth and progress of our smaller cities is just as important to the solution of the urban problem as the rebuilding and improvement of our big cities.

The President's Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders also emphasized this point—as has Secretary Weaver of HUD.

Obviously, the strengthening and providing of jobs and opportunities in smaller cities will reduce the waves of out-migration into our already crowded and congested big cities and metropolitan areas.

And much of HUD's effort is concentrated in our smaller communities—a balanced effort to assist in the improvement of smaller cities and in the rebuilding and improvement of our large cities.

So, Mr. Chairman, we must proceed on both fronts—in the big cities and in the smaller cities—if we are to lead the way in the solution of these urban problems.

The appropriations we are providing in this bill should help immensely.

THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

For the Department of Housing and Urban Development we are recommending an appropriation of \$1,229,686,000.

We have made some reductions but the reductions made are largely in participation certificate sales authority.

After careful study and review, the committee decided not to recommend any sales of participation certificates for either HUD or the Veterans' Administration for 1969.

These sales are not needed because of substantial carryovers in such authority. They are not expected to be used in 1969.

Last year we authorized the sale of \$2,385,000,000 in participation sales for HUD.

The Department has not used all of this authority.

HUD at this time has some \$255 million in unused participation certificate authority.

The carryover is sufficient for the needs of these agencies for the coming fiscal year.

HUD needs \$25 million for this program.

We are providing this amount by direct appropriation.

As pointed out in the report, there is one exception—HUD's program of housing for the elderly and handicapped.

OTHER URBAN AIDS

While providing in excess of \$1 billion for HUD in new money, this amount does not by any means reflect the total outlay for city programs.

Direct appropriations for urban areas are estimated in the budget at \$2,740,400,000 for fiscal 1969. This includes appropriations we are recommending in this bill plus advanced funding for urban renewal provided last year.

Total Federal assistance for urban areas for 1969 will exceed \$22 billion.

This includes urban assistance from many Federal departments and agencies—the Department of Transportation, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Office of Economic Opportunity, among others.

This includes direct appropriations, loans, grants, and other commitments.

In addition to these items HUD also will, of course, continue its FHA and FNMA loan insurance and loan guarantee programs.

The total of some \$37,520,000,000 is provided in the President's budget for all types of urban aids and assistance.

SOME RESULTS

The ongoing HUD programs have provided much assistance for the cities.

Some 1,500 communities and 900,000

people have been served by HUD's public facility loan program.

Six hundred cities and 2 million 700 families have been assisted by the water and sewer grant program.

There are more than 2,100 public housing authorities in the Nation and 712,000 low-rent public housing units. Another 75,000 are scheduled for completion next year.

Low-income housing units built through HUD programs total 1,079,000 units of all types.

Urban renewal has carried the fight against blight and decay to 640 cities of all sizes. Since 1949 redevelopers have invested \$5,700,000,000 in the rebuilding of blighted areas. Federal appropriations of \$4 billion have been provided for urban renewal.

By the end of 1969 HUD will have assisted in the acquisition of 478 square miles of parkland in cities throughout our Nation.

More than 6,000 cities and towns have received planning assistance.

I cite these figures, Mr. Chairman, to enlighten those who are concerned that Congress has not acted in response to the problems of our cities.

Congress has acted—and acted decisively and substantially.

I repeat: Urban aids for fiscal 1969 total more than \$22 billion.

With the various home loan and insurance programs of HUD through FHA and FNMA, urban aid funds are increased to \$37½ billion.

Mr. Chairman, we have made some reductions in the space program—in the National Science Foundation—and in other agencies.

However, we are providing a generous appropriation for programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development—programs for our cities throughout the Nation.

In addition to the full budgeted amount of \$25,000,000 for housing for the elderly and \$1,000,000 for Alaska housing, we are recommending \$35 million for grants for neighborhood facilities.

We are recommending \$38,838,000 for urban planning grants, the maximum authorized.

We are recommending \$150 million for water and sewer grants.

We are recommending \$150 million for annual contributions for low-rent public housing.

This bill also carries an appropriation of \$75 million for open space park grants.

Despite progress made, there continues a pressing and evident need for low-income housing. In view of this, as pointed out in our committee report, we urged Secretary Weaver to concentrate much of HUD's resources on this problem.

We urged the Secretary to utilize all housing programs authorized by the Congress—all the tools available. These housing programs include the rent supplement program—the turnkey program—public housing—the leased housing program—and the rent certificate program among others.

We urged this action to help meet the need and supply the demand for low-income housing.

In this bill we believe we have presented a balanced program.

MODEL CITIES

For the model cities program, as we know, the President recommended \$1 billion.

The total presently authorized for the program is \$650 million. Legislation is required for the other \$350,000,000 before appropriations can be provided.

We are recommending \$500 million—a half billion dollars for model cities.

Two hundred million dollars for cities announced in the initial round.

Two hundred million dollars for cities to be announced in the second round.

One hundred million dollars for urban renewal in model cities areas.

I repeat: The total appropriation we are recommending for the model cities program is a half billion dollars for 1969. This is \$188 million above the funding level for fiscal 1968.

I think this is a generous appropriation for the model cities program, and we should see some results.

RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM

We considered a budget request for \$65 million for the free-enterprise rent supplement program—the new look in low-rent public housing.

We are recommending \$25 million for this program in fiscal 1969.

Some of the members of our committee felt the full \$65 million amount should be approved.

Some members felt that no funds should be provided.

We struck a compromise and agreed on a recommendation of \$25 million.

This represents a cut and reduction of \$40 million below the budget request.

In view of the evident need for low-rent public housing, I urge that the compromise figures of \$25 million be approved. This amount approved by our subcommittee has the support of the full Appropriations Committee.

This program offers the Congress an opportunity to give the housing program a generous injection of free enterprise.

This approach moves free enterprise into the field of public housing.

The program is an ongoing program. It is being utilized.

It is considered most attractive to private enterprise, private developers, private builders.

Of the \$42 million appropriated to date \$41,730,000 has been committed for rent supplement projects.

Today, there are 574 projects in 348 cities in 48 States.

These projects contain a total of almost 60,000 units of housing.

As of this date 2,200 families are living in rent supplement units.

Nonprofit sponsors include church groups of virtually all denominations, service organizations like Kiwanis and Rotary, fraternal organizations, trade and craft unions, and veterans organizations.

For 30 years we have had public housing which is government owned, government managed, government financed.

In contrast the rent supplement program is privately built, privately financed, privately owned, and privately operated. It is moving ahead.

And, unlike public housing, these units are in buildings that will remain on the

tax rolls and contribute their share of taxes to local government.

Insurance companies have announced that \$1 billion will be provided for participation in the rent supplement program.

This program is based on the sound principle of the substitution of private credit for public credit and deserves support.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Let us consider briefly the appropriations for the Veterans' Administration, the largest item in the bill.

We considered a budget request of \$7,015,458,000. This excludes the request for participation sales of \$515 million which was denied because of a substantial carryover.

The committee has made only nominal reductions from the request.

We are recommending an appropriation of \$6,974,207,000, for all programs of the Veterans' Administration.

There are approximately 26 million veterans in the United States and more than 66 million members of veterans' families and survivors.

It is estimated that veterans eligible for benefits will increase by 517,000 in 1969.

Nearly \$5,300,000,000—79 percent of appropriations we are recommending—is to finance benefits programs.

Another \$1,484,727,000 or 21 percent—is requested for medical programs.

Administrative expenses are only 3 percent.

Compensations and pensions—a fixed item by law—will require \$4,654,336,000 in 1969, the largest item in the bill.

This Nation has the most effective and most comprehensive veterans assistance program in history.

Our veterans deserve the best—and a grateful Nation is providing these great benefit programs.

SUMMARY

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I want to repeat:

We considered budget request totaling \$16,570,580,000.

We made cuts and reductions totaling \$2,899,944,300.

This constitutes a 17½-percent reduction.

This, I am advised, is the largest percentage in the history of our subcommittee.

We have achieved two goals in this bill:

First, we achieved some substantial reductions needed because of our budgetary situation.

Second, we have provided generously for the programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development for our cities.

We must get on with the unfinished business in our cities.

I want to commend this bill to you for your support.

This measure has been approved by the Committee on Appropriations, and I urge its adoption by the House.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ERVIN of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Approximately 8 years ago the Veterans' Administration,

the Bureau of the Budget, and the House Veterans' Affairs Committee tried to work out some agreement on a program for rehabilitation, upkeep of our veterans' hospital system in this country, which has a value of something close to \$2 billion. We finally came up with the figure of approximately \$100 million a year for a 10-year period.

Almost every year the Appropriations Committee has given the Veterans' Administration a figure similar to that. This year, of course, they have not. In your report you say that you have deferred the item of \$25 million for the construction of a hospital at San Antonio, Tex. The question I would like to ask is as follows: There is no limitation on any other money that has been given the VA. They can go ahead and use the money they have?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I would say to my friend that there are no funds in here for Federal building construction by the GSA. There is only one new hospital recommended which would be at San Antonio for about \$25 million. This item was deferred at this time, consistent with our policy of no new construction.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. But there is no limitation on any other money the Administrator has for the VA hospital system?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. As the gentleman knows, we are providing for hospital programs, and the funds can be available for repairs and improvements of systems, communications, and utilities, but no new hospital construction is provided in this bill. There are five new hospitals that are being completed at this time and will be in various stages of activation in 1969.

I would say to my friends from Texas that San Antonio is the next city on the list to have a new veterans' hospital. But since we did not provide any funds for other Federal buildings, we did not think it would be proper to fund this new hospital at this time.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. What the gentleman from Tennessee, the chairman of this committee, has said, is correct. I think, in direct answer to the question of the gentleman from Texas, it ought to be indicated that there is no limitation on funds for rehabilitation, the particular item that you are specifically interested in, and one that this committee is interested in, too.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. I think the gentleman has substantially answered the question I have in mind, which has to do with the provision of funds for construction of public buildings under GSA. Am I correct in assuming that this means that, since the \$63 million is eliminated, there will be no funds for contracts for new construction?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. There will be no contracts for new construction, but ongoing contracts will be finished. Those

that have already been let will be funded and completed. However, funds are being provided in the amount of \$10 million to continue to acquire sites and planning for 11 buildings that are planned for the future. So planning will be continued.

Mr. MONAGAN. I would like to ask one further question, if the gentleman will yield. We have recently had information of a general policy agreement on the part of the executive and the legislative branch relating to the reduction of expenditures, the reduction of budget requests. Does this proposed bill fit in with that policy? If so, in what respect?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Yes, I understand that there may be an amendment offered to limit expenditures. We are 17.5 percent below the budget, I would say to the gentleman. I do not know what level of funding or expenditure limitation may be proposed, but certainly we have made our cuts. We have made more than our share.

I do not think another expenditure limitation proposal should be made to this bill. We have made substantial cuts already in both appropriations and expenditures.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, if I understand this bill, we propose to appropriate over \$4 billion for space and \$1.2 billion for HUD. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee mentioned a figure of \$22 billion, which he says will be spent in the cities, but I assume that in this figure he is including health measures, welfare measures, education measures, while the fact remains that for slum clearance and for improving the horrible housing conditions in our cities we are not appropriating more than the amount of this bill.

I would like to keep this in perspective, to show our system of priorities is \$4 billion for space and \$1 billion for housing.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry the gentleman did not understand the message correctly. I tried to convey that the Federal Government is making financial commitments of over \$22 billion in all programs for the cities. This has been pointed out by the President. I also refer the gentleman to the tables on pages 14 and 15 of volume III of our hearings showing the various expenditures in our cities. It totals \$22.245 billion for 1969. This does not include the loan programs, the insurance programs, and the guaranteed financing, which is an additional \$15.281 billion, for a total of \$37,526,000,000.

The gentleman did not get my message that a substantial total by the Federal Government is going to the cities. This often is not fully understood.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I still do not get the message of the \$22 billion.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman should have heard the President's speech or read the President's message. He should read the hearings of our committee. Again I refer the gentleman to the tables on pages 14 and 15 of volume

III of our hearings, which go into great detail. We asked the Secretary of HUD to give us this information.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, this is a good place in the RECORD to disclose the fact that the Department of HUD will carry beyond fiscal year 1969 and into 1970 funds amounting to \$23,720,000,000 of previously appropriated money, and only \$6 billion of that has been obligated, and \$17 billion is lying down there unobligated.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, let me say before I yield to my distinguished friend from Illinois that he is a very valuable Member of our House, an articulate and able Congressman, and a former member of our subcommittee who has rendered a great service in presenting the case for the cities. The gentleman is a great and valued Member of Congress.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the gentleman for the encomiums just heaped upon me. The gentleman is a great and distinguished chairman of this subcommittee and has just proved himself worthy of the tradition so eloquently established by his predecessor, Congressman Thomas, of Texas.

The gentleman is eloquent and able. But I look at the tables to which the gentleman has referred, in volume III, pages 14 and 15 of the hearings, and the gentleman is correct in stating the totals.

As I read those tables, however, there is no indication as to what the programs are that are supposed to be beneficial to the cities. Rather, all that is set forth in these tables is list of the departments and agencies to which is ascribed the expenditure of certain funds to the cities. There is no description of what the programs are.

I think that our committee, the Appropriations Committee should detail the programs generally listed on page 15.

Members from time to time have stated the vast amount of help made available to the cities. The figures of \$22 and \$37 billion have been used several times. I think it would be well if the staff of this committee were to set out in detail what programs and what amounts make up the \$22 billion and \$37 billion in assistance that is supposed to go to the cities.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I will say to my friend, our staff has the information. It was prepared by the Department of HUD. Secretary Weaver supplied the data and information which are in the tables.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. YATES. One cannot dispute it, because one does not know what makes it up. All we have is a summary of expenditures, without knowing to what programs those expenditures are attributed.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I will tell the gentleman that for the Department

of Health, Education, and Welfare, for all programs, it is \$8.9 billion.

Mr. JOELSON. That is Housing and Urban Development, but the gentleman is talking about HEW.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I am talking about Federal aids to urban areas, where 70 percent of our people live, and where we have critical problems to which this Congress is addressing itself.

We would be irresponsible if we voted huge sums without considering what the other agencies are doing concurrently.

Mr. YATES. Could the gentleman tell us what is the minimum amount of population that is defined in the word "cities" to which these expenditures are applicable? Would a city of 1,000 be included in this table? Would a city of 1,500 be included in this table?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. We have problems in all of our cities. The great burden is in the large metropolitan areas, such as Chicago, which the gentleman represents. The lion's share is going to those areas. There are some planning and water projects in other areas.

Mr. YATES. Does the gentleman know that to be a fact?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Yes. We had testimony that the great percentage of the appropriation goes into the metropolitan areas.

I say to my friend, if we are going to solve the problems of the big cities we also have to solve the problems of the smaller cities and the outmigration into the larger cities. Whatever we can do to relieve the pressure on the cities by assisting the smaller communities is another approach to a solution of the problems of the major cities.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. YATES. I believe the gentleman misconstrues my attitude. The gentleman from Illinois is grateful to the gentleman for the speech he made earlier, acknowledging the great crisis which does exist in our cities.

The point I am making is that the table to which the gentleman referred is inadequate, because it does not show that 90 percent of the funds go into the cities of the size of Chicago or New York or San Francisco or Philadelphia.

I believe it would be helpful if, in addition to the information contained in these hearings, there were a statement as to where the money goes, by size of cities, and as to the programs to which the expenditures are attributable.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The Office of Economic Opportunity spends another \$1.6 billion in the cities.

Mr. YATES. But that program does go to cities of 1,000 population or 2,000 population and under.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Does the gentleman wish to discriminate against smaller cities and the medium sized cities?

Mr. YATES. I have no willingness to discriminate against any city. What I am trying to do is to get the facts, and I do not believe the tables give us the facts.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The tables are clear and available for the gentleman's consideration.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON] also a valued member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. JOELSON. I appreciate that statement.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. He is also a Member who is difficult to satisfy.

Mr. JOELSON. I am very unsatisfied, and I hope I stay that way until we get adequate appropriations for the cities.

I should like to ask a question. This Congress established a separate Department of Housing and Urban Development, as a separate Department of Government, yet this Appropriations Committee still does not have a separate subcommittee for that Department. We consider their appropriation along with that for NASA, CAB, and others. I should like to ask the gentleman why we cannot have a separate appropriation bill for the cities just as we do for the farmers?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman is aware that many of our subcommittees have more than one Department. He serves on one that has three Departments. We have only one, the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The gentleman is familiar with the history of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. It was formerly the Housing and Home Finance Agency. This of course was an independent agency and was in this bill. It has remained with this group and we have tried to recognize the demands of the cities. We believe they are treated very well in this bill.

Mr. JOELSON. I believe, if the gentleman will allow me to say so, that the subcommittee is overworked with too many agencies, and HUD should be under a separate subcommittee.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that the Independent Offices Subcommittee has cut the budget for the National Science Foundation by \$100 million, which is \$95 million less than the present fiscal year. The question I have then goes to the way in which these cuts will take place. It is my understanding from your report that you believe in the competence, the skills, and the abilities of the Director of the National Science Foundation, Dr. Haworth, and the members of the National Science Board headed by Dr. Handler. As a result of this trust they are given the authority to make the reductions which this cut of \$100,000,000 will entail where they see fit. Is that correct?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct. We have great respect for Dr. Leland Haworth, the Director of the National Science Foundation, and Dr. Handler, the Chairman of the National Science Board. They are doing great work in upgrading science and in making grants to universities for scholarships all through the Nation. We have generally allowed the Foundation to make a decision on priorities as to which program has the greatest importance and the

highest priority. The funds for the National Science Foundation are provided in a single appropriation. We do not want to hurt the work of the National Science Foundation. They can allot the funds as the Board determines.

Mr. DADDARIO. If the gentleman will yield further, it has been the history of the National Science Foundation that when cuts are made there is a certain amount of discretion involved in the making of them and this discretion is reposed in the Director and the members of the National Science Board. As I recall it further, in 1966, when a cut of some \$50 million was made, it was directed at that time that the programs to develop centers of excellence in science and engineering not be affected. Even though the gentleman in the well has said he has faith in the National Science Board, on page 22 of the bill it is provided:

That of the foregoing amount not less than \$37,600,000 shall be available for tuition, grants, and allowances in connection with a program of supplementary training for secondary school science and mathematics teachers.

So what we have here is a situation where on the one hand the gentleman in the well says that \$100 million shall be cut and the economies shall be made by the Director and the members of the National Science Board, and then he puts a limitation on them in one category. If this is adhered to the cuts must necessarily be deeper in the other NSF programs.

I would respectfully suggest to the chairman of the subcommittee that when the proper time comes it is my intention to offer an amendment so that this part I have just referred to will be struck and so that there can be a fair allotment of the cuts necessary within all programs rather than to have one program favored above the rest.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. We are giving them flexibility to make these allocations wherever they see fit, and the priorities can be determined by them.

A few years ago it was the thought that one of the best ways to support science was at the teaching level. A broad base was what we wanted rather than at the top scientific level. They are doing great work at the top, but we felt if the base were broadened there could be a greater growth in science. That is the reason for allocating a certain amount to the base level. I do understand the gentleman's position.

Mr. DADDARIO. If the gentleman will yield further, it is understood, I am sure, by the gentleman in the well, the chairman of the subcommittee, that the House Committee on Science and Astronautics and its Subcommittee on Science Research and Development, which I chair, looked into the National Science Foundation in depth just a short time back.

We had a discussion about it on the floor of the House and we analyzed every program with which the National Science Foundation is involved. There is not any reason that one program be given a higher priority over the others.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Massa-

chusetts [Mr. BOLAND], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I would like to amplify what the gentleman has said with reference to the training and support of the institutes programs for secondary science and mathematics teachers. Since the inception of this program many years ago, and perhaps before some of the present Members of the Congress came here to serve in this body, this committee recognized a need for Federal support in this area.

The bill provides \$400 million for the Foundation for fiscal 1969. There has been a \$100 million cut in the National Science Foundation. However, with reference to the strengthening of secondary science and mathematics teaching no one who has ever served in this Congress since the National Science Foundation came into being has ever wanted to undercut it by not properly funding its requests. I say this with respect to both the Director, a very able gentleman, and those who serve on the board.

However, Mr. Chairman, there are \$400 million in this bill for that agency, and the remainder we have written into this bill has been studied in every single instance and every member of the subcommittee has looked toward the goal to meet that need. However, the Congress of the United States ought to have some say as to where the money is going to be spent. This is precisely what we are saying because we were so impressed with the operations of this program that we felt that this was an area where there ought not to be severe cuts made. The reasoning behind the committee's thinking I think is very simple. We think it is a great program and is a program which is working well. And, we want to make sure that it will not be undercut.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts has explained the position of the committee precisely.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

(Mr. KYL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KYL. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want him to understand that the criticism which has been leveled at the tables which appear in the hearings, particularly on page 15, is not a unanimous criticism. I think the committee has provided a valuable service in pointing out such things as the fact that \$716 million, plus, in the Department of Agriculture appropriations are actually spent in urban areas. The table and the information which it contains, is of invaluable assistance in trying to determine where the money is going and to avoid duplication.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Many of these funds go for such programs as the school lunch program and the food stamp program in the various cities of the country.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. With reference to the table to which the gentleman from Iowa just referred and the table to which the gentleman from Tennessee, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee just referred, there is stated therein that the Department of Defense—military and public—spent almost \$1 billion—\$839 million in 1969 in the cities.

What would that entail? What would be the nature of those programs?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. There are National Guard armories, civil defense, and other installations and programs in the cities.

Mr. YATES. In the Department of Defense?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Yes, I am sure the gentleman is familiar with the program of matching grants for city hall jobs and jobs connected with civil defense, for example.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time during the reading of the bill for amendment I intend to offer an amendment that would prohibit the use of any funds appropriated by this legislation for the payment of salaries to any employee who is convicted of being involved in any act of rioting or civil disobedience, and this amendment will contain the same language that was approved by the House as an amendment to the agricultural appropriation bill last week—last Wednesday, I believe—and to the NASA authorization bill last Thursday, and will also have similar language that was approved by the Congress in the HEW appropriation bill last year, and the Office of Economic Opportunity authorization bill.

If the gentleman will yield further, I wish to point out that I feel that it would be far more appropriate to act on this matter by general legislation, but we are confronted with an emergency. I recognize that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has acted on this matter in their committee. But as I stated before we are confronted with an emergency and cannot take a chance on any delay. We have already had one act of rioting and civil disobedience here involving several Federal employees. We have been warned that there would be other actions of disruption of Government activities and civil disobedience. It is, therefore, imperative that the Congress take every action possible to prevent this from happening and to punish swiftly and severely those involved. Under no condition should we have anyone working for the Government or on the payroll who is involved in any activities that could result in the destruction of that same Government.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], who is the able chairman of the subcommittee which conducted the hearings and has jurisdiction over the subject matter in the bill, has made a comprehensive and detailed analysis of it for you.

In addition, the committee has filed for your information a 40-page report containing a discussion of the most significant items taken up by the subcommittee and also detailed tables showing by agency and department a comparison of the funds provided last year, the amounts of new obligational authority requested this year, and the funds recommended by the committee for fiscal year 1969. I commend this report to your consideration and believe you will find the answers there to most if not all of the questions that may occur to you to aid you in understanding what this bill contains and the reasons advanced by the committee for actions taken by it.

There are some sections in the bill, and some comments in the narrative of the report, which need emphasis. I will confine my remarks to a discussion of these items.

The subcommittee began hearings on this bill on February 5, 1968, and did not conclude them until March 28. The hearings are contained in 3,508 pages of testimony printed in three large volumes and these are available to Members. During the hearings, which usually lasted 5 hours a day from February 5 to March 28, the subcommittee heard and examined 427 witnesses.

This is one of the largest bills, money wise, you will have for consideration this year. It provides funds to finance the operations of 20 separate independent offices, agencies, and commissions, plus the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

To fund the 1969 operations of these agencies and HUD, the budget requested appropriations of \$16,570,580,300. The bill before you represents a reduction of \$2,899,944,300 in the budget. It provides \$13,670,636,000 in new obligational authority. Funds provided in this bill amount to \$4,290,683,650 below the amounts provided for fiscal year 1968.

The committee considered 91 separate items of appropriations and limitations. Reductions are recommended in 70 instances. In a few instances the amount requested was approved. In no instance was the budget request increased. Some requests were denied outright. But in the majority of the cases, substantial reductions are recommended. Percentagewise, the reductions amount to 17.4 percent of the budget requests.

The denial of the request to "sell" \$2,085,000,000—\$515,000,000 by the VA and \$1,570,000,000 by HUD—of participation certificates accounts for that amount of the reduction in new obligational authority as requested in the budget.

Members will remember the fight I led last year or all appropriation bills to deny the Administration the authority to raise money for general operating expenses by the use of participation certificates. That fight was based upon the conviction that the use of participation certificates is the most expensive way for the Government to borrow money. Confirmation of this is now at hand.

On March 27, 1968, Fannie Mae raised \$730 million by the use of participation certificates, and in doing so accepted a record annual net interest cost of 6.45 percent per annum as follows: \$200 mil-

lion due April 8, 1971, at 6.30 percent interest, \$330 million due April 9, 1973, at 6.45 percent interest, and \$200 million due April 8, 1988, at 6.45 percent interest.

Since the use of participation certificates is clearly the most expensive way the Government has of borrowing money, and since the agency and department that planned to use this method and which sought \$2,085 million in new authority to use it, did not plan to use the proceeds to finance any of their operations—with the exception of HUD for housing for the elderly and handicapped—and the proceeds would have been used to defray general operating expenses of the Government, the committee denied the entire request. Instead, it made a direct appropriation of \$25 million for housing for the elderly and handicapped fund.

On this item alone we have saved \$12,052,000 in subsidy payments—excess interest to be paid over the interest derived from the mortgages pledged—in 1969. This saving will be an annual one for the outstanding life of the participation certificates. On a 5-year basis, the total saving on this item alone would be \$12,052,000 times 5 or \$60,260,000. On a 10-year basis, it would be \$12,052,000 times 10 or \$120,520,000.

THE POWER OF REPETITION

It is generally agreed that repetitive claims constitute the most effective tool available in the advertising world. This tactic is used to sell a great variety of consumer products. This tactic is also used to sell programs and mold public opinion in the field of political activity.

In the political arena, repetition of false charges is equally effective. It is well recognized that truth seldom catches up with fiction when the latter is systematically proclaimed.

An example is easily available. For a number of years now the country has been flooded with repetitive charges that Congress is cold and indifferent to the needs of our cities and equally indifferent to the needs of our people who are in the poverty category. This is a false charge and I think it is time for Members of Congress to mount a counteroffensive against those who are misleading the people.

The Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, testifying in 1966 before a committee in the other body, stated that the U.S. Government is spending more than \$25 billion a year financing programs of benefit to urban communities. In his message to the Congress on cities, President Johnson pointed out that the Federal Government is currently committing more than \$22 billion a year to help solve the problems of the cities and that these funds are expended through more than 100 programs. The special analysis to the budget contains the following statement:

The Department of Housing and Urban Development estimates that the total Federal financial commitment for urban, social and community development aids could be considered to exceed \$37 billion in 1969—more than twice the level in 1961.

Despite these facts, we frequently hear charges made by a mayor whose

city has been torn by rioting and looting that the Congress has been sitting on its hands and failing to provide funds to combat city problems. Last year, following the summer riots, the Vice President of the United States indicted Congress in similar fashion. The facts show that Congress does not deserve critical comment, and I personally directed a communication to the Vice President expressing my own resentment over the false charges levied against the Congress. The distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations made a speech on the floor, following a similar outburst by the mayor of one of the largest cities in the land, pointing out in detail the many ways in which Congress is providing funds designed to benefit those who reside in the urban communities of the country.

In an effort to give you some ammunition to use in combating these false charges in your home districts, I am going to relate the facts with respect to just a few of the programs funded in this bill for that purpose. I would express the hope that colleagues in speeches at home before civic and other groups would take up this challenge and answer these charges because they are untrue, as the record will demonstrate.

PUBLIC HOUSING

First, let us look at public housing. This program was inaugurated in 1935 and was sold to Congress and the country as one that would solve the need for low-rent housing for the poor. Since the program began, 712,000 public housing units have been constructed around the country. These units are administered by 2,100 housing authorities. They are financed by a commitment of the Federal Government to make up the difference, in annual contributions, between what the units cost to construct and the amount of residual receipts received through rents collected from the occupants. The construction costs are amortized over a period of 40 years so the Government is thus committed to a 40-year program with respect to each of these housing units.

Since the program began, and through fiscal year 1969, the Government will have expended \$2,777,201,455 in annual contributions to bridge the gap between residual receipts and amortization costs on public housing projects.

Not a single one of the 712,000 units has been paid for because the 40-year program has not expired. Nevertheless, HUD witnesses testified before the committee that 125,000 of the units need modernization and that it will cost \$250 million to modernize them. It was stated that the annual cost to amortize this rehabilitation program will be \$20 million a year for 40 years or \$800 million. As time goes on, many of the remaining 587,000 units will have to be modernized also.

The amount of these annual contributions for which the Government is obligated is going up rapidly. The following table shows how this program grows in cost:

URBAN RENEWAL Annual subsidy

	Million
1967 -----	\$250
1968 -----	275
1969 -----	350

Let me repeat for emphasis that these contributions will continue and grow in amount for 40 years.

In the early 1950's, a new program was inaugurated to attack the problems of decay and blight in metropolitan areas. This program is known as urban renewal and \$4,075,000,000 in Federal funds have been expended so far on urban renewal. Several years ago the committee adopted a policy providing for advance funding for urban renewal. So while it is not reflected in the totals in the bill before you, new obligational authority in the amount of \$750 million becomes available for urban renewal in 1969 under prior appropriation acts. This additional \$750 million will bring the total of appropriated funds for urban renewal to \$4,825,000,000.

MODEL CITIES

In 1966 another brandnew program was sold to the Congress. The program was called "demonstration cities," but that title was not glamorous enough so it was changed downtown to "model cities." Who could possibly oppose the creation of a "model city"? What resident would object to his city becoming a "model city"? This is an example of using a Madison Avenue tactic because the term "model city" is much easier to sell than "demonstration city."

However, be that as it may, late in 1966 Congress made available to the administration \$11 million to be used by the Department of Housing and Urban Development to make grants to a select number of cities to finance the preparation of plans to convert areas of the selected cities into model neighborhoods. But HUD moved with very deliberate speed and did not even select the 75 cities that would be recipients of the \$11 million in planning grants until the early part of November 1967. It took the Department nearly a year, after the money was made available, to select the first group of cities. No one has given a satisfactory explanation for this delay. But while the Department was delaying the announcement of the first group of cities, the administration last year requested \$662 million in additional funds for the program. Twelve million of this amount was to be used for planning grants for a second group of cities later to be selected. Since testimony before the committee clearly indicated that the amount requested was far in excess of what could be required, due to the extraordinary delay in selecting the cities, Congress appropriated \$312 million last year. Of this amount, \$12 million was to be used for planning grants for the second group of cities, \$200 million was to be used to make supplemental grants to the first group of cities after their plans are filed and approved and \$100 million was to be used for additional

urban renewal projects within the model city areas.

Despite the administration's foot dragging that has characterized this program since its inception, the budget this year called for an additional \$1 billion of funds for the model cities program, which was to include the second installment of supplemental grants to the first group of cities, initial grants to a second group of cities later to be selected, and additional urban renewal funds for both groups of cities.

Since none of the funds provided for supplemental grants last year will be expended until late this year after plans are filed and approved, it became obvious that all of the additional funds requested in the budget this year would not be required. So the committee in its wisdom approved and recommends an appropriation of \$500 million for 1969. Of this amount \$200 million is to be used as a second installment of supplemental grants to the first group of cities, \$200 million for supplemental grants to the second group of cities yet to be selected, and \$100 million for additional urban renewal projects within the model city areas. Twelve million was provided last year for grants to the second group of cities to finance the preparation of their plans. But the second group of cities has not even been announced. And if the pattern established last year is followed, it will be late in 1968 before this second group of cities will be announced.

RENT SUPPLEMENTS

Another brandnew program was inaugurated in 1966. This program is called rent supplements but in ordinary language this simply means the payment of cash subsidies to supplement rent payments made by tenants for the rental of housing units.

This program requires dual action by Congress. First we grant contract authority, which means that the administration is given authority to obligate the Government to pay rent supplements or subsidies for a period of 40 years, and the second part of the program is the appropriation of the actual dollars required to pay the subsidy due on a year-to-year basis.

So far the total amount of contract authority granted under this program amounts to \$67,000,000, including the \$25,000,000 in this year's bill. But to understand the cost of the program it is necessary to multiply that figure by 40. In doing so, it is found that the taxpayers are obligated to put up \$2,680,000,000 over a 40-year period on this program alone. So far \$19,100,000, including the \$12,000,000 in this year's bill, has been provided to enable the administration to make the payments due on occupied units. This of course will also continue for 40 years and will increase as more units come on stream and are occupied.

This year the budget requested \$65 million for new contract authority for additional rent supplement units and \$15 million for subsidy payments on occupied units. It is crystal clear from the hearings that the rent supplement pro-

gram is not moving forward as rapidly as its proponents claimed would be the case. It is therefore extremely doubtful if a sum even approaching \$65 million can be used efficiently next year so the committee in its wisdom reduced that request to \$25 million and reduced the request for payments to \$12 million, a total of \$37 million for this program next year.

OTHER PROGRAMS

I will not undertake to list all of the multitude of additional programs funded in this bill for assistance to cities, but will list a few of the most significant ones for the information of Members and those who read this RECORD, as follows:

	Million
Urban renewal (made available from prior year appropriation)	\$750
Model cities	500
Public housing, annual contributions ..	350
Rent supplements, new contract authority	25
Rent supplements, annual payments ..	12
Basic water and sewer grants	150
Open space land grants	75
Neighborhood facilities	35
Urban planning grants	38
Housing for the elderly and handicapped	25

It is interesting to note that the administrative and nonadministrative expenses for the Department of Housing and Urban Development funds as provided in this bill amount to \$190,439,000.

It is also interesting to note that the Department of Housing and Urban Development will have on hand at the beginning of fiscal year 1969, in previously appropriated funds, a total of \$21,709,540,000 in unspent funds and \$15,512,556,000 in unobligated funds, of which \$10,996,554 will remain unreserved.

Despite this record of colossal appropriations made by Congress in the field of housing and urban development, there are those who continue to say that Congress is doing nothing and continues to be indifferent about the needs and problems of urban communities. It is time for the Members of Congress to meet this charge head-on and unless we do that, and explain to the people what has been done in this field, many of them will continue to be misled by the repetition of these charges. I urge my colleagues to join me in a special effort to see that the people are made aware of the facts.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. I think the gentleman is making a very persuasive—really persuasive argument. But on the question of authorization, we have in this bill a NASA appropriation when the other body has not even authorized any money.

Mr. JONAS. I do not want to go into that because we discussed that under the rule. I really do not think it is pertinent. I do not like closed rules any more than anybody else. But we do not want to have to go through this a second time. We had already marked up the bill. We changed it after the House approved the authorization bill and we did not bring this bill to the floor until after the funds for NASA were authorized by one House of the Congress.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I want to say that I am in agreement with the gentleman about foot dragging. And, yet, as one reads the

hearings, one finds these are very complicated programs; second, they are programs in which the cooperation of the cities and the initiative of the cities is essential. Would not the gentleman agree that the cities, too, have been guilty of foot dragging and that they have not cooperated fully with the Federal agencies in making their proposals and plans available promptly so that the test of feasibility under the statute could be applied to them?

Mr. JONAS. I will just say it is not my purpose today to point a finger at anyone. What I am trying to do is defend the Congress against unjustified criticisms that we are indifferent to the problems of the cities and we have been delaying action. Not only is that charge made here on the floor but elsewhere.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. In view of the discussion regarding appropriations for other departments which go into the cities, I wanted the gentleman to assure the House that the funds he is talking about which were appropriated, but which have not been spent, are pure HUD funds appropriated to that Department to be spent by that Department.

Mr. JONAS. I have not gone down and checked the books. I am just taking HUD's word for it. They put the table in the record. We asked them for the table. The table lists carryovers and expenditures. It shows the figures that I have already related. It shows, and the gentleman can see it if he will consult page 629 of the hearings, that \$10 billion is down there unreserved. The following table shows the amount of these unspent, unobligated and unreasoned funds:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT—CARRYOVERS AND EXPENDITURES—FISCAL YEAR 1969 OUTLAYS AND BALANCES

[In thousands of dollars]

Appropriation or fund	1969 ap- propriation request	Carryover into 1969			Estimated 1969 outlay			Carryover (out of 1969)				
		Unobligated balance ¹			Obligated balance	From prior year funds	From 1969 funds	Total	Unobligated balance			Obligated balance
		Reserved	Unreserved	Total					Reserved	Unreserved	Total	
RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE												
Grants for neighborhood facilities-----	40,000	18,169		18,169	24,997	32,000		32,000	23,169		23,169	27,997
Alaska housing-----	1,000						1,000	1,000				
Salaries and expenses-----	36,360						36,360	36,360				
Urban renewal programs:												
Enacted 1969 appropriation-----	750,000											
Proposed appropriation for model cities-----	500,000	² 1,697,981		² 1,697,981	2,786,881	700,000		700,000	² 2,147,981		² 2,147,981	2,886,881
Advance appropriations for 1970-----	(1,400,000)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
Loans and planning advances-----			172,320	172,320	568,048	11,000		11,000		93,599	93,599	635,769
Rehabilitation loan fund-----			23,905	23,905	3,845	18,500		18,500		5,736	5,736	3,514
Low rent public housing:												
Annual contributions-----	358,000				128,512	119,512	209,406	328,918				139,594
Loan fund ⁴ -----			1,296,105	⁵ 1,296,105	191,464	-8,663		-8,663		1,313,499	1,313,499	200,483
Housing for the elderly or handicapped:												
Appropriation to fund-----	(⁶)											
Participation sales insufficiency appropriation-----	3,260	81,625	10,374	⁸ 91,999	97,529	93,037		93,037	76,625		76,625	87,476
Collect housing loans-----	(⁷)											
Participation sales insufficiency appropriation-----	⁸ 63,291	240,999	2,033,247	⁵ 2,274,246	283,645	326,214		326,214	291,000	2,542,230	2,833,230	232,148
METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT												
Urban planning grants-----	55,000				56,939	46,000		46,000				65,939
Open space land programs-----	85,000		323	⁹ 323	124,391	60,000		60,000		323	⁹ 323	149,391
Grants for basic water and sewer facilities-----	150,000	46,948		46,948	222,361	130,000		130,000	46,948		46,948	242,361
Grants to aid advance acquisition of land-----			3,000	3,000	1,970	500		500				4,470
Salaries and expenses-----	8,700					8,700		8,700				
Public works planning fund-----		2,598	394	2,992	14,140	2,040		2,040	2,598	304	2,902	12,190

Footnotes at end of table.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT—CARRYOVERS AND EXPENDITURES—FISCAL YEAR 1969 OUTLAYS AND BALANCES—Continued

(In thousands of dollars)

Appropriation or fund	1969 ap- propriation request	Carryover into 1969			Dbligated balance	Estimated 1969 outlay			Carryover (out of 1969)			Dbligated balance
		Unobligated balance ¹				From prior year funds	From 1969 funds	Total	Unobligated balance			
		Reserved	Unreserved	Total					Reserved	Unreserved	Total	

METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT—Con.												
Urban mass transportation:												
Grants:												
Enacted 1969 appropriation	175,000	}										
Additional appropriation for 1969	15,000			170	170	292,724	150,000		150,000		170	170
Advance appropriation for 1970	(230,000)		(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
Loans			58,753	58,753		—390		—390		59,143	59,143	
Public facility loans	(¹⁰)	}										
Participation sales insufficiency appropriation	11 4,430		8,748	317,432	326,180	120,941	53,309	1,098	54,407	8,748	358,919	367,667
Liquidating programs			2,561	2,561	16	—599		—599		1,167	1,167	9
Investment in flood indemnity operations			500,000	500,000						500,000	500,000	
DEMONSTRATIONS AND INTER- GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS												
Model cities program	500,000		147,500	147,500	49,768	197,268	52,732	250,000				447,268
Urban renewal add-on	12 (500,000)		(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
Urban information and technical assistance	5,000				1,700	1,700	1,300	3,000				3,700
Community development training programs	7,000				2,500	2,500	2,200	4,700				4,800
Fellowships for city planning and urban studies	500				616	491		491				625
Salaries and expenses	1,860						1,860	1,860				
URBAN TECHNOLOGY AND RESEARCH												
Urban research and technology	20,000				7,364	4,800	2,500	7,300				20,064
Low income housing demonstrations	4,496			(⁹)	2,984	2,984	816	3,800				3,680
Special studies			295	295	100	395		395				
Housing studies ¹³			2,500	2,500						2,500	2,500	
MORTGAGE CREDIT												
Federal Housing Administration												
Rent supplement program	16,600				589	589	15,511	16,100				1,089
Community disposal operations fund			1,293	1,293	197	—8,142		—8,142		935	935	197
Federal Housing Administration fund	14 1,100,783		1,100,783	1,100,783	—24,839	26,122		26,122	14 1,074,357		1,074,357	—24,535
Federal National Mortgage Association												
Loans to secondary market operations fund			2,406,000	2,406,000		28,000		28,000		2,378,000	2,378,000	
Special assistance functions	(¹⁵)	1,404,283	1,175,379	2,579,662	787,811	430,600		430,600	1,534,283	1,906,539	3,440,822	630,251
Management and liquidating functions	(¹⁶)			(⁹)	25,630	25,630	28,870	54,500				31,365
Participation sales fund	17 576,909		576,909	576,909	85,909	—206,190		—206,190	17 903,112		903,112	112,927
Secondary market operations (trust fund)			2,181,081	2,181,081	337,683	590,000		590,000		1,830,981	1,830,981	228,783
DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT												
General administration	8,000						8,000	8,000				
Regional management and services	8,925						8,925	8,925				
Administrative operations fund					200	200	—3,245	—3,045				3,245
Working capital fund	2,000		881	881	369	—87	287	200		2,509	2,509	541
LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM												
Areawide development grants	10,000						3,000	3,000				7,000
HUD legislation	30,000						14,000	14,000				16,000
Subtotal, Department of Housing and Urban Development	2,859,422	5,326,543	10,186,013	15,512,556	6,196,984	2,829,320	393,320	3,222,640	6,108,821	10,996,554	17,105,375	6,614,708
Adjustment for interfund transaction and applicable receipts from the public								—6,738				
Total, department of housing and urban development	2,859,422	5,326,543	10,186,013	15,512,556	6,196,984	2,829,320	393,320	3,215,902	6,108,821	10,996,554	17,105,375	6,614,708
Advance appropriations for fiscal year 1970	(1,630,000)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)

¹ Excludes unused balances of 1968 participation sales authorizations.² Represents balances of contract authorization, not all of which has been appropriated for.³ Not applicable.⁴ Loan fund balances are dependent on proposed legislation pending in HUD Act of 1968.⁵ Portion of unobligated balance to be transferred to other accounts.⁶ No appropriation is being requested. However, a participation sales authorization of \$25,000,000 is being requested. This amount is needed to provide the funds necessary for the program level.⁷ \$300,000,000 borrowing authority becoming available. In addition, a participation sales authorization of \$285,000,000 is being requested.⁸ Includes \$12,061,000 from permanent indefinite appropriation for 1967 sales and \$51,230,000 proposed in 1969 for 1968 and 1969 sales.⁹ Excludes unappropriated portion of contract authorization.¹⁰ A participation sales authorization of \$80,000,000 is being requested.¹¹ Includes \$1,305,000 from permanent indefinite appropriation for 1967 sales and \$3,125,000 proposed in 1969 for 1968 and 1969 sales.¹² Appropriation and balances included within urban renewal programs.¹³ Reflects unused contract authorization.¹⁴ Represents primarily FHA insurance reserves for future expenses and loans.¹⁵ Participation sales authorization of \$655,000,000 is being requested. In addition \$525,000,000 borrowing authorization becoming available.¹⁶ Participation sales authorization of \$550,000,000 is being requested.¹⁷ Reserves for retirement of participation certificates.

(Mr. JONAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Subcommittee on Inde-

pendent Offices and the Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Subcommittee, I am encouraged both by the wisdom of the savings we have achieved in certain areas of this

bill and by the allocation of funds we have made specifically in the area of housing and urban development.

As a Representative from the greater Cleveland, Ohio, area, I am very mindful

of the important partnership which must exist between our cities and the Federal Government in getting our communities on their feet again. For years Cleveland has been bogged down in one of the sorriest urban plights in the Nation. Just over a year ago, when the plight was truly desperate and no funds at all were being allocated to Cleveland, I tried to get the situation off dead center by calling a meeting of Cleveland city officials and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Dr. Weaver. I am pleased that this year the situation has changed, that the funds Cleveland has so urgently needed are beginning to be returned to the taxpayers in the form of construction and action.

As our subcommittee report states, the cuts made in the HUD budget are almost entirely composed of deferral of sale of \$1.6 billion in participation certificates, since the new obligatory authority to be provided from such sales is not considered necessary for funding HUD programs in 1969.

Our appropriation provides for programs to attack urban blight, inadequate housing, and related social problems which have been a major factor in creating the misery and rebellion which have scarred our cities in the past few years. Housing for the elderly and handicapped, college housing loans, grants for neighborhood facilities, public housing, urban planning grants, open space land programs, water and sewage facilities, model cities, urban mass transportation, and rent supplements are included in the HUD funds before us today.

It is important to point out that the \$1.2 billion for which we ask the House's approval is only a fraction of the massive attack we have mounted: HUD has substantial programs in terms of budget obligations and expenditures, financed in corporate and trust fund accounts. The Department of Housing and Urban Development is quoted in the special analysis to the budget as estimating "that the total Federal financial commitment for urban, social, and community development aids could be considered to exceed \$37 billion in 1969."

Much remains to be done and this requires time as well as funds. But I hope that our action today will provide another stride forward toward an America where urban blight and slum housing will be relics of the past.

As one who has always been deeply concerned about economy in government, I would like to emphasize that our subcommittee has made sizable overall reductions in the Independent Office budget, without sacrificing any essential services or programs in any of the 23 agencies and departments involved.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO].

(Mr. DADDARIO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, it has not been my intention here to cast any reflection on the Appropriations Committee and its handling of the National Science Foundation budget. It is my intention to see if we can allow the cuts

which this bill imposes to be made equally in all NSF programs.

It is somewhat of a surprise to me that the committee would find itself so sensitive to the admonishments which may come from members of other committees who have had some familiarity with the programs over which the Independent Offices Subcommittee finds itself in budgetary control.

The fact that the section to which I referred, on page 22, has always been in the bill cuts no ice with me at all, Mr. Chairman. The fact is that this was in at a time when the National Science Foundation was in its infancy. I would not believe that we stand here with our feet in concrete and do not realize that from time to time things in fact must change.

When the subcommittee of which I am chairman, the Subcommittee on Science Research and Development, looked at the National Science Foundation, one of the determinations it made was that certainly this program was an important one. It listed a whole series of others which were equally important.

The one place where I believe we struck a sensitive nerve, and which the Congress responded to, was that there would be support in the science areas for institutional development activities which would hit into those areas of the country where there was little activity going on insofar as science was concerned and that this geographical situation should be looked at and something in fact should be done about it. I think we can take pride in the leadership the Director and members of the National Science Board have taken in this regard. All you have to do is look at the grants and the contracts made in these areas. Take a look at the institutional support in such colleges as Grinnell in Iowa, St. Andrews Presbyterian College in North Carolina, and Hampton-Sydney and a whole multitude of schools throughout these 50 States. The fact is that as we help those universities with the highest quality we must in fact build up the areas in the country where science and research activities have floundered. It is because of that, and with no aspersions cast on this particular teachers program to which I direct my remarks.

Let us assign the necessary priorities to the programs and repose confidence, as the report indicates it is the intention so to do, in the Director and the National Science Board. I am sure that the 35,000-some teachers who participate in this program to which we are presently referring are not going to be cut off. This is a solid, integrated program. It need not stand on a pedestal such as this which is included in the bill. It has deserved support, and it is my understanding that the National Science Foundation recognizes that this is the case. If you do not give the flexibility to the Director and to the members of the Board, what you are in fact going to do is to put the emphasis of the cuts on newer programs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DADDARIO. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the time which has been yielded to him by the chairman of the subcommittee is about to expire, I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be recognized for an additional 5 minutes in addition to the time already yielded to him by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, this Foundation has worked for 15 years to foster basic research in science education. Now it is time to make the Foundation into a broader instrument for forging and shaping, in company with the Federal mission-oriented agencies, the national policies to foster the national resources for science and to focus and direct them toward the attainment of great national goals. Full employment, a clean world to live in, a population imbalance with resources, swift and ready transportation and communication, pure water to drink, education of the citizenry, discovery of new resources—all of these and other needs of the Nation must depend in part upon thorough, deliberate and positive efforts to learn more about our physical world, its creatures and its peoples and their relations with one another; and to apply this knowledge skillfully and with judgment, and to have ready for application the requisite science resources.

This applies to the National Science Foundation as a whole and its place in our society. If we look back a few years, we can see that scientific activities of the country have generated the need for additional resources in science and the NSF is a developing resource structured to fill this need.

Dr. Hornig, in talking about the National Science Foundation, said its goal was to strengthen American science *per se*; that the National Science Foundation is, of course, the only agency that has a fundamental responsibility to help all basic American science.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DADDARIO. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my distinguished colleague for his excellent statement. The committee is in full accord with what the National Science Foundation is doing. It is a great agency, and it is upgrading science in this Nation in all areas. It has done a great work. We respect the National Science Foundation.

However, there is \$400 million in this bill for the National Science Foundation.

Mr. Chairman, during my years of service on the committee we have seen this budget grow in amount. We know the great contributions that the National Science Foundation has made, but we know that we must make some reductions. We must set priorities because of our stringent budgetary situation. We felt that we could defer some of their activities at this time.

The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO] is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Science and Aeronautics. He is a great Congressman and a great gentleman. He is to be commended for his dedication to the cause of science.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, but I would like to say that I cast no stone toward the subcommittee. The gentleman mentions that there is an unobligated carryover of \$46.5 million. The fact remains that this is not because the National Science Foundation has not been doing its work, it is because it has lived up to Public Law 218, which has in fact compelled it to put this money aside.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding the additional time.

The fact that these funds have not been expended, would indicate that they have not been doing their work properly. They have followed the admonishments of Public Law 218, and that is all there is to it.

But, Mr. Chairman, in the final analysis it is not my purpose here to do anything but to give an indication of my concern about the situation, and to hope that in this particular regard the subcommittee would in fact look at the agency as an agency which has a multitude of responsibilities and that no one part of it is superior to another.

And if, in fact, you do this, I believe that this would be going a long step toward recognizing the importance of the National Science Foundation, and recognizing also at this time that, cuts being in order, that the people who administer NSF ought to be given the flexibility and the authority to put things in their proper perspective. And whatever they do in this regard they will have to answer to the Congress. So I believe they ought to be given this opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DADDARIO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

[Mr. COHELAN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

(Mr. COHELAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests at this moment for time.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the chairman of the committee to a sentence on page 14 of the committee report which reads as follows:

The Committee has deferred funding the request for an appropriation of \$25,412,000 for the construction of a new 760 bed VA hospital at San Antonio, Texas, at this time.

That project is somewhat familiar to me, being located in the part of San

Antonio which I have the honor to represent.

As I understand it, there has already been expended about \$1½ million on preliminary plans, architectural, and engineering work, which is now in the process of being completed, which is necessary before contracting can be done for construction.

My purpose in seeking this time is to ask the chairman of the committee to clarify the position of the committee with respect to the language which I have quoted.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I will say to my distinguished colleague that there are no funds in this bill for Federal building construction. Under these circumstances, we did not feel that we should put money in the bill for the hospital construction program at this time.

There are three new VA hospitals that are being fully activated in 1969. Two others are being completed and will be staffed for part of the year after they are completed. The San Antonio hospital is in an advanced stage of planning and it is the next in order of priority for construction by the Veterans' Administration. It has merely been deferred because of the budgetary situation.

Mr. FISHER. As I understand it then, the gentleman and the committee are quite aware of the importance of this project and the justification for it?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman has spoken to me about it. I assure him that the hospital will be built—it has just been deferred.

Mr. FISHER. I appreciate the gentleman's clarification.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ].

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and I wish to add my voice to that of my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, from the 21st District.

This hospital originally was in my district, but by reapportionment it is now in the 21st District.

Mr. Chairman, this is a vitally needed hospital. San Antonio already has some 23.5 percent of the veteran population of the State of Texas. I am glad to hear that this does have priority and at the first available opportunity it will receive the money grant.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the chairman of the subcommittee, or some member of the committee, a question or two concerning this bill.

Only last week the House passed the authorization bill for NASA. What was the figure that was approved in that bill—which I voted against—but what was the figure that was approved?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The House authorized \$4,031,000,000 total as I re-

call, I will say to my friend at this time. The gentleman will recall that there were two amendments adopted on the floor—one to cut research and another amendment to cut administrative operations.

Similar amendments were offered in the Committee on Appropriations or in Committee of the Whole and they were adopted to bring it in line with the reduction made.

Mr. GROSS. So the figure we have in this bill is the same as the authorization bill?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. No. It is \$23.2 million less, I will say to the gentleman. We made further reductions. The space program had expenditures of over \$6 billion a few years ago. This has been reduced, and last year it was \$4.5 billion. We cut a half billion dollars out of the space program last year and this year we made further reductions below what the House authorizing committee made.

So I will say to my friend who is an excellent Member of this House and always the watchdog of the House for economy that we are on a hard rock-bottom budget for NASA at this time.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. Then this bill is what—\$23.2 million above or below the authorization?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. It is \$23.2 million below the authorization, I will say to my friend. We have made reductions in construction.

The only thing in this bill for construction is to repair and improve some launch pads and communications.

Mr. GROSS. It is still a \$4 billion expenditure on the National Aeronautics and Space Administration with approximately \$2 billion for a program to put a man on the moon in the dim and uncertain future. Is that correct?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct with regard to the money amounts, but he is not correct with respect to the 243,000 people employed in the program throughout the Nation and in all the States.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know that I said anything about employment.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Oh, yes; I discussed employment. The number of employees in the NASA program used to be 420,000. Now it has gone down to about 243,000. They are laying off about 4,000 a month under these cuts.

Mr. GROSS. I had hoped that the committee would have cut it some more.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. As the gentleman remembers, some years ago I tried to take several hundred million dollars off the part of the Apollo program to which the gentleman has made reference and to increase the funds available to the Air Force to help in the military control of space. But we are now in a situation in committee where they tell us that if we do not go ahead with the \$2 billion for Apollo, the \$20 or \$22 billion that has already been put into it will have gone down the drain. So we are just stuck with it.

Mr. GROSS. I do not say this with any disrespect to the gentleman, but that down the drain argument is one of the most shopworn arguments that we hear. The program should have been cut back when the gentleman tried to do so some years ago.

Had that been done we would not now be confronted with the statement that we must continue to spend billions because we have spent billions in the past.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. They claim it is not just going down the drain. The problem of our dilemma relates to the long-range policy of this country to put a man on the moon before someone else does, meaning specifically the Soviets. There are a lot of people employed in this program. Many prominent citizens think it is important to the United States, and I think now we have gone so far that it should be carried through at the level to which it has been projected throughout these years to which we have committed so many billions of dollars at this time.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to my friend from New Hampshire that it is far more important to me, as one individual Member of the Congress of the United States, to know what is floating around in space; whether those vehicles carry nuclear warheads and, if so, whether we have devices for the detonation of those vehicles in space. Yes, as far as I am concerned, it is far more important to know what is happening in connection with those satellites than it is to put a man on the moon and get a handful of moon dust to take to that brandnew \$14 million laboratory in Houston, Tex., for analysis.

Of course, as I have said time after time, if we ever do get a man on the moon and there is a living soul on that planet, we will be up there with a multi-million-dollar foreign aid program.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. I would like to make the observation that, as the gentleman knows, I have been trying for years to get an increased emphasis in space policy and programing on the intercept capability between here and the moon in our space program. This is squarely a military capability for our own national survival. I would like to say, too, if the gentleman would read the hearings, he would find that no less a person than Mr. Webb has admitted that once a man has gone to the moon, emphasis on the American space program in terms of manned space flight thereafter, will have to come back closer to earth. This is extremely significant because there is no place beyond the moon in terms of reality that we can ever fly human beings to and bring them back to earth in the foreseeable future. It takes too long. They are too far away. And I might add, and not facetiously, that we have vastly greater immediate concerns here on earth and near to earth.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Before we get too far in the record from the comment last made by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, I am sure he meant to say that several hundred thousand employees are not in-house employees of NASA. They are contract employees. I just wanted the record to show that.

Mr. GROSS. Quite a demonstration is made of cutting a few thousand employees out of NASA. Unless we cut the dollar appropriations to NASA with respect to personnel, they simply go out and hire consultants and other contract employees.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I am really surprised that the gentleman from Iowa did not compliment the gentleman on the cutting of the budget by \$362 million in this one program. That is a pretty good slice.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman mean in NASA?

Mr. JONAS. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. It could stand a much deeper cut.

Mr. JONAS. Does not the gentleman really think this is a pretty good job?

Mr. GROSS. This bill ought to have been sliced 24 percent in accordance with the cut in the Agriculture appropriations bill. This bill, we are told, has been cut 17 percent. Let us get another 7 percent out of this bill. I ask that of the chairman of the subcommittee: How about another 7-percent cut?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I will say, we have cut this \$2,899,000,000, almost \$3 billion just out of this bill, which is a 17.5-percent cut, the highest cut ever made in the history of this subcommittee as far as we have been able to determine.

I wonder how far our good friend would like us to go? To what levels would we have to go to satisfy his desire to use the meat ax?

Mr. GROSS. I suggested we go down to the level established in the precedent set by the Agriculture bill, a 24-percent cut. Our farmers are not doing well at all, yet spending on agriculture was cut 24 percent.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I am one who agrees with my friend on the necessity for our farmers to be prosperous.

Mr. GROSS. How much did the gentleman say the bill provides for rent supplements?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The committee authorized \$25 million.

Mr. GROSS. How much is provided in this bill?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Twenty-five million dollars.

Mr. GROSS. Twenty-five million dollars?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. One hundred and fifty million dollars authorized. We cut it \$40 million this year, and there is a need for 60,000 houses per year for 10 years. There is a great and sore need for low-income housing in this Nation.

Mr. GROSS. Our farmers need more than 22 cents a dozen for their eggs; too, and they are not getting it.

Let me advise the House here and now that I will try to reduce this spending still further by offering an amendment to cut the rent supplement out altogether. This program never should have been started. Why should the taxpayers subsidize the paying of rent for anybody in this country?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. We subsidize our farmers on some programs, and I support that.

Mr. GROSS. And we cut their appropriation 24 percent a few days ago. Let us get this down by 24 percent.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Chicago.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman should say he yields to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Chicago, Ill.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, it is still the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me and for recognizing the fact that Chicago is in Illinois.

Mr. Chairman, I am an alumnus of this subcommittee, many of my happiest hours were spent in hearings with those who are now members and with the chairman of the committee. They are my friends and they are among the most able Members of the House. I question their judgment with trepidation. By and large, they have done a very good job on most of the bill.

I have honest differences with the committee on the housing portions of the bill and this is not unexpected nor unusual for each of us has his own ideas. But all of us who come from the large and great cities of the country know the validity of the statements made by President Johnson in his message to the Congress on the crisis in the cities when he said:

For several decades, now, the tide has run against the growth, strength and vitality of our cities. Today, America's cities are in crisis. This clear and urgent warning rises from the decay of decades—and is amplified by the harsh realities of the present.

We see the results dramatically in the great urban centers where millions live amid decaying buildings—with streets clogged with traffic; with air and water polluted by the soot and waste of industry which finds it much less expensive to move outside the city than to modernize within it; with crime rates rising so rapidly each year that more and more miles of city streets become unsafe after dark; with increasingly inadequate public services and a smaller and smaller tax base from which to raise the funds to improve them.

If the promise of the American city is to be recaptured—if our cities are to be saved from the blight of obsolescence and despair—we must now firmly set the course that America will travel. There is no time to lose.

There is no time to lose. The gentleman from North Carolina speaks of the great amounts of money which are still unobligated and unused

by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. I believe his figure was \$21 billion. This is a large sum, but still it is far from adequate for the purposes of the programs it relates to.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] made this point very cogently on page 16 of the hearings, where he questioned Secretary Weaver. He said:

The figure of \$37 billion includes everything, all types of programs?

Secretary WEAVER. Yes.

Mr. BOLAND. That is, the total to assist individuals and communities. But this really isn't too significant a figure when we start to attack some of the problems of the cities themselves that we are trying to solve now; is that so?

I repeat, there is no time to lose, Mr. Chairman.

That is a great deal of money, I will agree with the gentleman from North Carolina, but it is still only a drop in the bucket to what must be expended if the promise of the cities is to be recapitulated.

How much is it worth to build decent, slum-free neighborhoods in which to raise our children and decent housing? How much is it worth to us to provide schools in which all our children may receive quality education? How much is it worth to us to have safe streets to walk, to have air and water free from pollution, to have streets unclogged by hordes of traffic vehicles?

In short, how do we stop the flight of our young married people from the cities to the suburbs? How do we keep them in the cities?

We are moving much too slowly. We are moving too slowly in respect to appropriations, too, I would say to the gentleman.

Yes, the war in Vietnam and the whole Military Establishment have limited the funds available for civilian purposes, but our goals for the cities are still worthy and necessary goals. The life, the culture, the vitality of America's great cities must be saved and must be fostered.

How much is this going to cost? Certainly it will cost a great deal more money than the \$21 billion which the gentleman from North Carolina says now is in HUD. Certainly it will cost a great deal more money than is contained in the tables which are found on page 15 of the hearings of this committee.

But funds or lack of funds is only a part of this picture. Of equal importance is the fact that these programs are bound down by enormous redtape and by the complex mechanics of achieving our goals.

The gentleman from North Carolina referred to the footdragging of the Department. I believe that in some measure this is true, but I have found the leaders of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to have been cooperative and are sincere in their efforts to try to achieve the goals of the legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield me another minute?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

Thus, I believe it is the cities as well that have been dragging their feet. The cities have to develop the primary thrust to implement these programs. Unless they move quickly, unless they move strongly to implement the programs they must fail, because the Federal Government cannot do it by itself.

But the cities, too, are prisoners of procedure. They are prisoners of compulsory legal processes, of laying out plans, of local consultations in neighborhoods, of eminent domain proceedings, of consultations with engineers and city planners and architects, of having to resolve disputes and arguments in order to come to some plan.

But the fact remains that we must move, and quickly, because time is running out. Procedures must be speeded up.

And funds are still needed. The funds which are available, to which the gentleman from North Carolina referred, are still inadequate to deal with the problems of the cities in the fields in which housing and urban development are concerned.

I would not, speaking for myself, have cut the model cities appropriation, as did this subcommittee, by almost 25 percent. I would not have cut the rent supplements program by approximately 40 percent. I think these programs are desperately needed by the cities today, and I think they should be corrected.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding and associate myself with his remarks.

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, we are considering H.R. 17023, an appropriation bill of vital importance—a bill which can bring decent housing and a healthy environment for hundreds of thousands of families in slums and blighted areas. It is a bill which will permit scores of large and small communities to rebuild slums or blighted neighborhoods into healthy neighborhoods where people can live meaningful lives.

I, and many of us, would have been pleased if the Appropriations Committee had voted out the full amount requested for the Department. At the same time, however, we are aware of the responsibilities they faced this year. I do not question the action of the subcommittee or that of the full committee. They have acted in the best interests of the Nation.

I urge you to support the funds voted for the model cities program and the rent supplements program. The model cities program is the first Federal program for treating the whole range of physical, economic and human problems of slums and blighted neighborhoods.

The model cities program permits the use of existing Federal programs, including a wide range of housing programs, in a frontal attack on these areas and remake them into social and economic

assets. It permits the use of Federal, State, local, and private resources to attack human and physical blight. Seventy-five cities are now developing their first year action plans of their 5-year overall plans. Seventy more cities will be selected this summer to start the model cities process.

I urge you to support the committee's recommendation of \$500 million for the model cities program.

This bill also provides funds for the rent supplement program which enables poor families to live in decently private-owned housing. This is a program which serves families whose incomes are low enough to qualify for public housing and this is the program which was endorsed by the National Association of Real Estate Boards and the National Association of Home Builders.

The rent supplement program utilizes the resources of private enterprise to build, own, and manage new or rehabilitated housing. The low-income families or individuals pay 25 percent of their income toward the required rent. The difference between the amount paid and the rental as approved by the FHA is paid monthly as a supplement to the project owner. For next year, the committee has recommended \$25 million in new contract authority, substantially less than the original request.

Both the rent supplement program and the model cities program are what I consider "must" items, if we are sincere in our efforts to upgrade the quality of living for millions of our fellow Americans.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield to me?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. I certainly agree with the gentleman on the desirability of funding the full amount of the budget request, but I did not get the opportunity before, because I was called out, to acknowledge that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] has a very valid point about all of the money lying around unused. In the city of Paterson, N.J., which I represent, there has been money available for urban renewal and because of a very unfortunate local situation, there has been inaction. Although we need a lot of money, what is equally important is that we need dedicated people who will be willing to cut through the redtape and do the job needed. I think the gentleman from North Carolina is doing a service in pointing this out.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman. The cities must appreciate and assume responsibility to speed up their own programs so that, together with the Federal Government, they may accomplish the goals set forth by the Congress in this legislation.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman in the well.

In the time that I have served in the Congress he has always been an eloquent

spokesman for the cities. The gentleman understands the problems of the cities and he has understood them over the years. As a matter of fact, 14 years ago, when I first joined the Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the Committee on Appropriations, which was then chaired by the very great and distinguished and beloved chairman, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Thomas, I recall so well so many of the fights that the gentleman from Chicago waged in regard to public housing. At that time it was a terribly significant part and one of the most important programs that faced this subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. The gentleman from Illinois states the case for the cities well. He is able and articulate and eloquent in stating his deep interest and concern for the cities and their problems.

There have been some figures given with respect to public housing, and they are used in this report and appear somewhere in the hearings, indicating that we have built or will build by the end of this fiscal year some 787,000 low-income public housing units. That is a very impressive figure—if you say it fast and do not relate it to the need. The fact, of course, is that there are some 6 million substandard houses in the United States. The Federal Government got into the matter of public housing back in 1937, with the passage of the Housing Act. In that year the program was first authorized after the Federal Government expressed a willingness to do something about substandard housing and to provide adequate new housing for low-income families. Now, if you divide the number of units by the number of years, it just comes to some 2,500 units per year. I submit that this is a dismal record in low-income housing.

I could not agree more with the gentleman from Illinois that we have to make a start in this program. There is a crying need to meet the problems now confronting the cities. Indeed, we must meet these problems. If you are going to accomplish anything significant at all, we have to implement the recommendations of the Kerner report.

I note that a few weeks ago the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency did report out a housing bill which starts to strike out in the direction of solving some of the housing problems in the ghettos. There is no question about the fact that we are not going to get rid of the problems of the ghetto unless we start to solve the problems of housing, of unemployment, of education, of welfare. These are the four areas of greatest concern.

This committee, because of the sense of responsibility shown by both its majority and minority members, is beginning to unravel these four knotty problems. I hope we can continue this progress. We have the model cities program, but we have not provided the full amount in this particular legislation because there was a judgment made by this committee that the model cities program cannot develop that rapidly. The \$300

million that Congress appropriated last year is still available to HUD for allocation to the communities for the model cities program, but cannot be distributed to them until they have completed their planning requirements. The community planning phase, it is estimated by HUD, will take from 6 months to 1 year, and the first round of 75 model cities participants were announced by Secretary Weaver only last November. Therefore, HUD has not only the \$300 million appropriated by Congress last year, but will have an additional \$500 million recommended by this committee, for a total of \$800,000,000 when this bill clears Congress. The members of the Appropriations Committee well know of my concern for the success of the model cities program, I want it to succeed.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts has been one of the great champions of the programs pertaining to our cities over the years and I am delighted that he is a member of this subcommittee. In addition, the gentleman from Massachusetts has had the opportunity to see some of these programs implemented.

Mr. BOLAND. I appreciate the kind remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES]. Let me say to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON] that he has also been a champion in the Congress in this area. However, there have been problems and delays. A lot of this does not rest alone with the Federal Government. There are many reasons for delays.

Mr. Chairman, I suppose we are better off by going slowly, because, by doing so, the people involved in the program may not be unduly upset, and in the end we may accomplish a better job.

Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Secretary Weaver, has done an outstanding job in pulling his Department together. He has been ably assisted by Under Secretary Robert C. Wood.

They have brought into the Department some of the most able men they could find, with experience in their particular field; namely, Philip N. Brownstein, Assistant Secretary for Mortgage Credit and Federal Housing Commissioner; Raymond H. Lapin, President of the Federal National Mortgage Association; Don Hummel, Assistant Secretary for Renewal and Housing Assistance; Charles M. Harr, Assistant Secretary of Metropolitan Development; H. Ralph Taylor, Assistant Secretary for Demonstrations and intergovernmental relations; Dwight A. Ink, Assistant Secretary for Administration; Thomas C. McGrath, Jr., General Counsel, and formerly our colleague here in the House of Representatives from New Jersey; Ashley A. Foard, Deputy General Counsel; William B. Rose, Deputy Under Secretary for Policy Analysis and Program Evaluations; Thomas F. Rogers, Director, Office of Urban Technology and Research; L. Edward Lashman, Assistant to the Secretary for Congressional Services and Andrew Hickey of Congressional Serv-

ices; John M. Frantz, departmental budget officer and National J. Eisenman, deputy departmental budget officer.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to insert in the RECORD at this point two excellent editorials published by the New York Times and the Washington Post today, urging no further cuts beyond Appropriations Committee recommendations for rent supplements and the model cities programs.

[From the New York Times, May 8, 1968]

A VOTE FOR THE CITIES

The House of Representatives is scheduled today to consider the bill to provide money for several agencies, including the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

In deference to demands to restrain spending until the Federal deficit can be brought down to a tolerable size, the House Appropriations Committee has made substantial reductions in the sums requested by President Johnson. But in assessing the housing programs, the committee has also shown a commendable effort to recognize the severity of the crisis in the nation's slums.

The result is a defensible compromise. The sum of \$25 million recommended for the rent supplement program and of \$500 million for model cities is in each instance one-half or less of the sum proposed by the President. If the Vietnam war were over, we would urge a much bigger expenditure for these programs. But at least the committee has funded them at higher levels than last year and thus would make possible useful experimentation and gradual expansion until the time comes when it will be possible to move ahead on urban social problems on the scale that their magnitude actually requires.

The danger now is that a conservative coalition in the House will seek to cut these appropriations still further either through an across-the-board reduction by some arbitrary percentage or by knocking out the rent supplement money entirely. The animus in Congress against the latter program is difficult to understand and impossible to justify.

The program is a promising attempt to involve private enterprise in the rehousing of the poor. It is also an effort to get away from the stark, institutional quality of public housing projects. Those who benefit from the program are the very poor who cannot pay an economic rent and whom society will have to subsidize in one form or another if they are ever to have decent homes.

Fiscal responsibility does not require further cuts in these programs, and social responsibility demands that they be continued and strengthened.

[From the Washington Post, May 8, 1968]

ESSENTIAL URBAN BILLS

There are no panaceas for urban problems. But surely the House of Representatives can contribute significantly to the quest for solutions by passing the Model Cities and Rent Supplement appropriation bills when they come up for a vote today.

The appropriation for rent supplements, only \$25 million as against a request of \$65 million, is important because it would provide more housing for each dollar spent than in other programs designed to aid the poor. Last year Congress prevented the rent supplement program from going forward by killing a \$10 million appropriation. Surely it would be shortsighted to reject again a program which promises to enhance efficiency.

The Model Cities program concentrates assistance to more than 3 million people who live in the most blighted areas of about 70 cities. President Johnson asked for \$1 billion, and the Appropriations Committee recommended \$500 million. No further cuts should be made in programs which promise to improve life in the restive urban slums.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

(Mr. BARRETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks relative to the gentleman in the well. They were very much deserved and I concur in everything which the gentleman has said about the need for harmony and the question of providing decent and sanitary housing to all homes for everyone in America.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois one question. The gentleman says we are moving too slowly with respect to appropriations for the conditions which exist in our cities.

Mr. YATES. I do not know whether I said that. If I did, I think we can still use more money in the appropriations for our cities.

Mr. WYMAN. If the gentleman will yield further, that is not my question.

Mr. YATES. I think the programs for the cities are going too slowly because—

Mr. WYMAN. Where would the gentleman get the additional money?

Mr. YATES. You could get \$165 million from the model cities program, for instance, and perhaps money from other sources.

Mr. WYMAN. In terms of priorities, would the gentleman just let the other matters go, or would he take the \$165 million out of the Treasury despite the fact that we now have this huge deficit?

(Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN].

Mr. WYMAN. If the gentleman from Illinois will remain in the well for just one moment, I would like to pursue a question. What would the gentleman, in terms of priorities, say is least important, that can be cut out, so we could find this \$165 million which he says is needed for this purpose. Would he take it out of the model cities program or would he just add it on to the national debt?

Mr. YATES. For one thing, I would vote for a tax increase. For another thing, I would phase over a longer period of time programs such as the highway programs that are chargeable to appropriations. I would phase out over a longer period of time the development of the SST. I would think the defense appropriation for civil functions could stand a significant cut. And, further, I would say that some of the agricultural programs could very well be reduced.

Mr. WYMAN. The gentleman knows that the highway program is carried on under a trust fund operation.

Mr. YATES. I referred to that portion which depends on appropriations.

Mr. WYMAN. What the gentleman is saying then is that in establishing his order of priority he would accord to our cities and the needs of our cities a higher priority than he would to these other items?

Mr. YATES. I would say that there is no higher priority in our country today than the need for our cities and the people who live in them. Does that answer the question asked by the gentleman?

Mr. WYMAN. I understand that is the position of the gentleman but, continuing for just one moment, there has been much to do in the last few days about reducing Federal expenditures by \$4 billion, or \$5 billion or \$6 billion, and reducing appropriations for fiscal year 1969, which are now before us, by \$10 billion; and there are some who would like to reduce it by \$14 billion.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I did not hear the question asked by the gentleman.

Mr. WYMAN. I would like to finish, and then I will yield to the gentleman.

In meeting this challenge—which directly involves the national solvency, is it the position of the gentleman that for the city programs there should be no reduction whatsoever, although in the Department of Housing and Urban Development there is more than \$20 billion backed up and unspent?

Mr. YATES. According to the gentleman from North Carolina, it is \$21 billion. Did the gentleman say \$37 billion?

Mr. WYMAN. The gentleman did not say \$37 billion in HUD.

Mr. YATES. All right; the \$37 billion appears in the table, I believe. If \$21 billion is backed up in HUD then the answer to that is that many of these programs were initiated within the last 2 or 3 years, they are just getting underway. They are undergoing the preliminary requirements to get the programs moving.

Second, the very complex procedure established by Congress in this legislation that must be applied at that local level. It is enormously time consuming. I would say that within a few years the \$21 billion backlog will be used up, and we will need much more money.

Mr. WYMAN. At that time it would be in order for us to make additional appropriations if justified. What I am trying to get across to the gentleman as a member of the Subcommittee on the Department of Housing and Urban Development, I can observe to the gentleman that they just did not make a case for anything more than \$500 million in the model cities program.

Mr. YATES. I read all of the committee testimony, and may I say that I had the honor to serve on this subcommittee for 14 years, and I have some knowledge of the programs. The point I am making is that the problems in our cities do comprise the paramount problem of our country today. Sufficient funds, even a surplus quantity of funds, must be made available to the cities in order to deal with these problems.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I want to

commend the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, and to say that I agree with him that the problems of our cities—the crisis of our cities—constitute the No. 1 problem of our country today. I emphasized this in my opening remarks but I did not say it as eloquently as the gentleman has done.

Mr. WYMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I commend the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would like to know where we could get an extra \$150 million, we can get it today from the space program, because I believe, rather than guided missiles, we have to have guided values in this country. I would also forgo rockets to prevent rickets, and I would forgo sophisticated missiles for educated people. And I say we do need priority, but we are spending almost \$80 billion for the military, and nobody can convince me there is not fat and waste there. I do not want to see urban renewal by molotov cocktails. I want to see this House exercise responsibility.

Mr. WYMAN. I want to assure the gentleman that I do not want to see urban renewal by molotov cocktails either, but I hope the gentleman will call his schedule of appropriations to the attention of his administration through which all priority requests come to Congress. Apparently this has not been done.

Mr. YATES. The administration requested \$1 billion for model cities. Only \$650 million was authorized. I will say to the gentleman that—I respect the judgment of the committee, but in my opinion at least \$600 million should have been made available.

Mr. WYMAN. The administration also requested certain such sums as \$4.5 billion for the space program, the same one to which the gentleman from New Jersey just referred.

Mr. YATES. I will say to the gentleman that I agree with the action of the committee in reducing funds made available for that program.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I did not get into the colloquy that has just ended, but I would very respectfully say to my friend from Illinois—and he is my friend—we have not agreed on all subjects, but we have agreed on many, when we served together on the subcommittee, that I believe the danger today would be that this \$500 million will be reduced instead of increased.

The gentleman has not forgotten the trouble this program has had in the past and the difficulty we have had in getting a compromise figure through this body.

That is why I am surprised when the gentleman keeps talking about this being a small appropriation. I think it is the most you can hope to get through this branch of the Congress.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. Apparently then a reduc-

tion was made because they thought that in this way they could get the whole program through the House rather than on the basis of what is considered necessary for the program.

Mr. JONAS. No; I must correct the gentleman on that. The committee recommends all it believes can be programed efficiently next year.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOLAND. Did my distinguished friend, the gentleman from North Carolina, at the time he was talking about the \$21,500,000 carryover, insert that table in the RECORD?

Mr. JONAS. I referred to the table and at the appropriate time, after the Committee rises, I will ask permission to include it in the RECORD.

Mr. BOLAND. I thank the gentleman. I think it is an important table.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HUNGATE].

(Mr. HUNGATE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUNGATE. I should like to make crystal clear, Mr. Chairman, where I stand on this problem.

I do not think the No. 1 problem in America is cities. I think the No. 1 problem in America is people. While many live in our cities, remember, some of these people live in the country. It was developed in debate the other day that only 47 of the congressional districts now are more than 20 percent rural.

But those people, I submit, are just as important as any other people.

I speak as one who has voted for agricultural appropriations along with my friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

I speak as one who has supported appropriations for rent supplements along with my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate this committee on the fine job I think it has done in getting down to the business of the country. They have cut billions from this bill. The amounts requested are what is necessary for these programs, and yet they eliminate many things that might be desirable but which perhaps we cannot at this time afford.

I think it has been asked, How are we going to halt the flight of people from our cities to the suburbs? I suggest that the answer is not by starving those people on the farms.

I hope that we can understand both of these problems. When people do not make a living on the farms, you know where they go—they go to the cities and to the suburbs and add to the overcrowding there and the housing problem and the overcrowded schools. They will need jobs, they will need more job training.

I think we must all try to understand both of these problems, urban and rural. I have looked at the press reports and the recent reports on the needs of the cities and industrial States and what they are doing for themselves. I just happen to read that in conjunction with

how the support went on the agricultural appropriation.

I see that in many of our urban areas and industrial States they do not have an income tax to help themselves to fight these appropriation problems. This includes States such as Connecticut, New Jersey, Illinois, Maine, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, and Washington. Some 16 Members from those States opposed agricultural appropriations. I predict many of them will support this Federal aid. I would suggest in our financial crisis, we must help people wherever they are and we cannot keep talking about the best way to do it, while postponing action.

I urge everyone to vote for this bill today in the form that the committee has reported it out after careful study, hearings, and deliberations.

I think in the future, I would suggest to all our friends, that it is not only the farmers who should pull in their belts. Some of these urban and industrial States or cities that now get by without any income tax may be expected by some of the rest of us to pass a State or local income tax devised at the local level to help meet these urban problems.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. POLLOCK].

(Mr. POLLOCK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Chairman, the small appropriation for Alaska native housing contained in the bill appropriating funds for the Department of Housing and Urban Development will begin an important and vitally necessary program for the poorest and most neglected of our fellow Americans.

Two years ago the Congress authorized a housing assistance program specifically designed to meet the needs of the Alaska native. The reason for such a program is twofold—the need because of extreme poverty and the complete inability of existing programs to satisfy this need.

The Federal Government many years ago declared that it had a special responsibility for American's aboriginal people. Despite this responsibility, the conditions existing in Alaska's native villages can be described only by comparing them with villages in undeveloped foreign nations. There is nothing like it anywhere else in this country. The President's recent message on the American Indian in general stated that "most Indian housing is far worse than the housing in many slums of our large cities." Alaska's native housing is even worse than that of Indians in general and the problems is made worse by the harsh climate.

A study has been made recently of housing in the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta region of southwestern Alaska. Median family income in this area, according to the last census, was a little over \$1,400. Nine hundred households with about 5,200 members in 28 villages were surveyed. Two-thirds of the houses had only one room, and one half had less than 300 cubic feet of living space per person. Another study relating to the spread of tuberculosis considers a volume of less

than 600 cubic feet per person to be very crowded and dangerous. Most houses are of frame or log construction and are without ventilation or normal sanitary facilities. A 1966 report by the Bureau of Indian Affairs stated that 97 percent of the Indian, Eskimo, and Aleut housing in Alaska is substandard. In the Bureau's opinion, the housing of the Alaska native is the worst of any group of people in the United States.

The effects of this situation on the people can readily be imagined. The health problem alone is gigantic. Today the average age of all Americans at death is about 70 years. By contrast, the average age at death of the Alaska native is 35, exactly half that of his fellow citizens. Infant mortality is astronomical. One-quarter of all native deaths are infants, and those who survive their first year risk serious disease or crippling illnesses. The rate of mental defects is high, and more than one-half of these deficiencies come from infectious diseases incurred during the first year of life.

Millions of dollars are spent annually by Federal and State authorities to improve native health. Success, however, cannot be achieved until the home environment is improved. Many natives are successfully treated for ailments in Public Health Service hospitals, only to be sent back to the same living conditions that caused the trouble in the first place. Decent housing is essential to improved health.

The program before you today is desperately needed to achieve the goals of a better life for Alaska's natives. Present programs are not suited to the job. This was pointed out in the committee report on section 1004, Senate Report No. 1455 of 1966. The cash income of most native people is far too low and erratic to enable them to take advantage of existing finance programs. Moreover, existing programs require minimum construction standards suitable to the rest of the country, but absolutely unattainable in rural Alaska. This program is designed to fit the specific remote Alaska situation, a situation so poor and deplorable that it cannot even reach up to the minimal standards of the normal programs for the poor.

The State of Alaska will operate this program and bear all administrative costs. Every penny of Federal money will go toward home construction. Self-help on the part of the homeowner will be an important part of the program. While grants are allowed, State authorities will make outright grants only where necessary. Loans will be made whenever the recipient can pay. The community must have some economics viability and each village to be eligible for this housing must have a community improvement plan.

Mr. Chairman, this appropriation is only \$1 million. To the Alaska native, however, there is nothing that is more important. It is a matter of keeping faith with those for whom we have declared a special responsibility. I urge that our promise long neglected, not be broken now. I urge an affirmative vote on this bill.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distin-

guished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the chairman of the subcommittee for the approach taken during the hearings in considering the budget and appropriations for the Interstate Commerce Commission. The gentleman from Tennessee has been a longtime friend of public passenger rail service in this Nation and revealed by his very penetrating questions during the hearings his appreciation of the issues involved.

However, Mr. Chairman, I was shocked by the answers that the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Honorable Paul J. Tierney, gave to some of the questions. For example, on page 521 of the hearings, when the subcommittee chairman commented on the need for setting certain minimum standards of passenger service, as discussed by ICC Examiner John S. Messer in the Southern Pacific case, Mr. Tierney responded:

There is a serious question as to whether or not the Commission has the power to require a certain type of service.

I think when the Chairman of an independent regulatory commission like the Interstate Commerce Commission prejudices a case as he has, he should disqualify himself from consideration of and passing on the recommendation made by Examiner Messer.

I invite this committee's attention to other examples revealed in the printed record of the hearings, indicating that Chairman Tierney appears to have a closed mind on the issue of passenger rail service. At page 513, in his prepared general statement to the subcommittee, Chairman Tierney boldly predicts:

Since September 1, 1967, 45 train-off notices have been filed. We anticipate increasing filings in this area during 1968.

Chairman EVINS expressed concern in the hearings that new mergers might result in abandonment of service to the public, and Chairman Tierney's best response was:

I would expect that as time goes on and as they study their situation, we could anticipate perhaps some requests for abandonment.

Again, when Chairman EVINS asked "Can't the Commission make some firm provisions in their orders that these points will be served," Chairman Tierney was evasive and negative in his response:

I think it would be difficult, Mr. Chairman, because conceivably some time in the future a very good case under the law could be made for an abandonment of a particular segment of the line. There may be no public need for it. So I don't think that we could say at the time the merger was being consummated that we would require the service thereafter at all points involved.

I submit, therefore, that the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission appears to have fallen down on his job as a guardian of the public interest. Such a lackadaisical attitude toward the protection of the public interest does not represent what we would expect from the chairman of a body established to protect the public interest.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from West Virginia yield?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Washington. He has taken an active interest in the preservation of good railroad passenger service.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from West Virginia yielding so that I can associate my own views with his with regard to the responsibilities of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I was highly gratified to read in the Report of the Committee on Appropriations on this bill that this great committee of the House is pleased that the Interstate Commerce Commission is becoming more responsive to the needs of the general public in directing improvements in service in rail and other transportation. I, too, am pleased.

I hope the Commission will uphold a recent examiner's report which takes the position that the railroads should be required to maintain adequate passenger rail service, including both short- and long-haul trains with food and sleeper facilities.

The country must have fast, frequent and low-cost public transportation. We have excellent passenger trains that serve the Pacific Northwest, such as the Empire Builder, the North Coast Limited and the City of Portland. Other areas should have similar service and ours should be continued.

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I appreciate the comment of the gentleman from Washington. Although the committee report does say—

The committee is pleased to note the Commission is becoming more responsive to the needs of the general public in directing improvements in service.

The report also significantly adds:

The Commission is commended and encouraged to take further action in this direction.

I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee what he feels the role of the Interstate Commerce Commission should be.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I do not feel that the role of the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission should be negative, or merely to say, "You can't do this," or "You may abandon this." I think they have an affirmative role to demand mandatory action by the railroads in many of these cases. I, like the gentleman from West Virginia, was pleased with the examiner's report. I have urged the Commission, if necessary, to appeal the question to the courts, to have a test case, so to speak. I think the Commission has affirmative duties as well as negative duties.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I very much appreciate that comment of the gentleman from Tennessee, because it is unfortunately true that all too often the Interstate Commerce Commission has been weak kneed in its efforts to protect the public interest. Certainly the Chair-

man of the Commission should speak out and act more aggressively on behalf of the public interest.

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DOWNING].

Mr. DOWNING. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I note the committee deleted the sum of \$500,000 for the construction of a sea wall at Wallops Island. Wallops Island is the smallest and the most economical and the most efficient facility in the entire NASA setup. In fact, it has been said that this little station produces for the taxpayer, more "bang for the buck" than any in the NASA stable of facilities.

Wallops Station is located on an island which is on the ocean side of Virginia and Maryland. It is subject to serious erosion, an erosion which threatens to cut the facility in two. In all honesty, I cannot tell you it will happen this year or next, but if we get a severe storm, there is a distinct possibility that the island could be cut in two. For that reason they asked for \$500,000 for the sea wall.

I am not going to offer an amendment to restore this amount, but I would ask the committee between now and the time you go to conference with the other body that you would investigate this and see if what I have said is true. If it is true, perhaps at that time you will consider reinstating this sum of money. In my opinion, the sea wall is necessary to preserve this facility.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I should like briefly to comment on two issues raised by the independent offices appropriation bill. One is the question of the appropriation for NASA, and on that I should like to commend the chairman and the committee for their very thorough analysis of the program.

The bill appropriates \$4,008,223,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. This is \$21.8 million less than the authorization figure adopted by the House on May 2.

Although I must confess some surprise that the Appropriations Committee has not cut deeper into this program as was widely expected, I think their approach is reasonable under the circumstances.

I want to call attention once again to the Nerva nuclear-rocket engine program. This is an extremely important issue, not merely because of the funds requested this year, but precisely for the long-range implications of the program which are so often cited in arguing for its presumed importance. The administration had requested \$60 million for NASA's portion of the joint NASA/AEC program, and the House refused to authorize any more than \$11.7 million of the request. For this reason no amount

of the appropriation in excess of \$11.7 million may be utilized for Nerva.

However, it is believed that strong pressure will be exerted by the Senate to restore the authorization close or up to the amount originally requested. I want to call this to the attention of the conferees and point out the importance of this issue. Beyond the fact that there is no mission requirement for this hardware program and that long-range plans for its use are highly debatable, the technical aspects and the matter of feasibility are still in question. There is a general tendency throughout the technical industry to cut hardware too soon, and I think this is one of the contributing factors to the severe cost escalations, which have come unfortunately to be taken for granted, and the high rate of technical failures which are tolerated too easily considering their enormous cost to the taxpayers.

As for the second issue, there is nothing more urgent, there is no higher priority than the conditions facing us in our major cities. At last I think Congress is beginning to recognize this. I regret the fact that the bill before us does not include full appropriations to the extent of the authorizations for the model cities program, the rent supplement program, the low-rent public housing program, neighborhood facilities grants, and other critical areas.

The model cities program offers an opportunity to bring to bear various techniques and methods in a coordinated attack on the very substantial problems of our cities, not only housing, but the sociological problems as well, the underlying conditions which have led to the disorders which have marked so many of our cities.

Your decaying cities are to be saved, then our affluent society must devote sufficient resources to the task.

The President's Commission on Civil Disorders recommended construction of 600,000 units of low- and moderate-income housing a year. That is not an extravagant amount. That is a reasonable amount. The jobs in housing bill—H.R. 16266—which I have cosponsored, would build 3 million low- and moderate-income units over a 4-year period.

The appropriation process should not be used to starve programs already authorized. This has been the sad history of the public housing program which in 1949 authorized construction of some 810,000 units which have yet to be completed.

The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 provided additional authorizations of \$47 million in each fiscal year 1966 through 1969 for low-rent public housing, making possible new public housing construction of an additional 60,000 units each of the 4 years. The proposed Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 would increase the authorization by an additional \$100 million on the date of enactment and by an additional \$150 million on July 1, 1969, and July 1, 1970, to increase the possible rate of new construction to 155,000 units annually. If such an accelerated public housing program is to begin, it is crucial that existing authorization be fully funded.

The new rent supplement program is suffering from the same underfunding that has plagued public housing.

There are currently 2,734 completed rent supplement units, another 16,108 units are under construction, and some 23,500 are in planning. That is a total of 42,342 units in one stage or another. The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 originally provided for a total of \$150 million in rent supplement contributions over a 4-year period—\$30 million, fiscal year 1966; \$35 million, fiscal year 1967; \$40 million, fiscal year 1968; and \$45 million, fiscal year 1969. However, in fact, only \$42 million of this authorization has been utilized thus far. The history of this program is sadly typical of the fate of urgently needed domestic legislation. The administration request was for \$65 million; this was further reduced in committee to \$25 million; \$108 million is available. In terms of housing units, this cutback reduces the rent supplement program by some 90,000 badly needed low-income units, which could be easily absorbed by New York City alone.

Similarly, the model cities program is starved for funds. This program, if adequately funded, could begin to regenerate entire areas of our cities. If we fail to provide the funds, the model cities program will become just another half-measure, which falsely raises the hopes of urban residents.

Last year, the administration's request was for \$667 million. This was more than cut in half, and the Congress finally allotted \$310 million. As the mayor of New York City remarked, "this entire amount is needed to regenerate one slum area in New York City alone."

The present available authorization for model cities is \$650 million. The administration has proposed that the authorization be increased in fiscal year 1969 and fiscal year 1970 by \$1 billion each year. It is, therefore, critical that the existing authorization be fully funded, so that the program may move forward. The Appropriations Committee, unfortunately, is recommending only \$500 million an amount equal to what is expended in Vietnam in a single week.

Why is it that expenditures for critical human needs are so often seen by a majority of this House as the most expendable?

The Committee on Appropriations has seen fit to reduce the budgetary request for the Department of Housing and Urban Development by more than 50 percent—from \$3.015 billion to \$1.229 billion. The two most critical new programs, rent supplements and model cities, have also been reduced in committee at least 50 percent.

I certainly hope that this bill will not be cut further. Let us begin to recognize the responsibilities of a great nation to save its cities.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I wish the bill before us provided the maximum authorization for the housing and urban development programs so vitally needed in our urban areas. It is heartening to see that the Appropriations Committee has at least voted some funds for such programs as the model cities program

and the rent supplement program. These two programs have an almost limitless potential in helping us toward our twin goals of rehabilitating our cities and providing the decent housing which our low-income families can afford and which they so desperately need.

On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, it is disheartening that the bill before us does not appropriate the maximum funds which could be made available under existing legislation and under the President's requests. For example, the committee has authorized only \$25 million for the rent supplement program when the President requested \$65 million. Similarly, the model cities program authorization falls substantially short of what could be authorized under existing law. Mr. Chairman, all of us in this body believe in economy and believe in the prudent use of our resources. Neither party nor any single Member has a monopoly on our common objective to use our Federal resources efficiently and for the best possible effect.

The thing that concerns me, Mr. Chairman, is that too often when people speak of economizing, unfortunately they seem to want to do so too often at the expense of our low-income families. In my judgment, this is the worst possible area in which to economize. Our urban crisis is now a stark reality before the Nation. Our urban problems and the problems of our urban poor cry out for solution and relief. The model cities program and the rent supplement program, which we fought so hard to create, provide the tools to make our urban environment better places in which to live and to provide the community facilities and the low-cost housing which our people need.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the full funding of these vitally needed programs and if it cannot be done on the House floor here today, I deeply hope that the ultimate conference report following joint Senate and House action will contain the maximum funds possible under existing law for these urgently needed housing and urban development programs.

Mr. RONAN. Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee has submitted for our approval today an enormously important bill which includes appropriations for the more than 100 Federal programs that deal with the problems of urban America.

The programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the legislation before us are concerned not just with clearing the slums and housing the poor, we are dealing with funds that help colleges build dormitories to house their burgeoning populations; construct water and sewer facilities in small towns; aid in urban planning; and promote open space and stimulate research into the problems of tomorrow.

The committee has reviewed the President's requests and acted prudently in reducing or deferring programs where possible. I believe we owe the committee our appreciation, and their diligence and expertise warrants our consideration.

According to some newspaper reports, an effort will be made in this House to cut back the \$500 million which the Ap-

propriations Committee has recommended for the model cities program.

I hope my colleagues will join with me in resisting any attempt to undercut a program that has been aptly described as the most promising of all the activities now underway to rehabilitate our cities. It is an imaginative program. It is a resourceful program. It gives the cities the opportunity to try new approaches and demonstrate new techniques in building better housing and supplying community facilities that are so sorely needed.

In a sense, it may be the incubator for a brandnew concept in seeking workable solutions to the problem of urban blight and all communities will profit from the lessons learned in these demonstration projects.

We cannot afford to ignore the promise of this program. Let us join with our colleagues on the Appropriations Committee in supporting adequate funds for the model cities program.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I want to add my support to the full \$500 million appropriation for model neighborhoods. The Appropriations Committee has already reduced the President's request for model neighborhoods and any further cuts would seriously cripple this key urban program.

Under the committee's recommendation, the 75 cities with model neighborhood planning grants will be able to move from planning to act. The recommended appropriation will also aid the 65 to 75 new cities that are about to qualify for planning grants.

As a representative of an urban area, I am well aware of this program's potential. My district, Minneapolis, Minn., is currently developing a model neighborhood proposal with a \$255,000 planning grant. Minneapolis is requiring the widest possible citizen involvement in the development of the model neighborhood plan.

Just recently, 99 members of the Minneapolis Model Neighborhood Policy and Planning Committee were selected in a general election open to all residents of the project area. A stipulation was made that 80 percent of the members of this committee would have to be residents of the model neighborhood area. Out of this 80 percent, at least half would have to be low income and/or minority. The remaining 20 percent of the committee would be composed of model neighborhood area business and institutional representatives who need not be residents of the area. The formation of this committee will be completed when eight teenage members are chosen by youth groups in the area.

This committee will have more than an advisory function. The official Minneapolis model neighborhood agency, the Minneapolis City Council, has stated all programs related to model neighborhood will be forwarded to the council solely through the policy and planning committee. This means that in addition to developing its own proposals, the committee will have a veto power over any proposals offered by city department heads or city planners. I feel it is extremely important for local residents to have this direct role in developing programs that affect them. Too often in the

past, citizen groups have felt that these programs were imposed on them by agencies that did not have a full understanding of community needs.

By involving community residents directly in development of a wide range of coordinated, concentrated urban programs, model neighborhoods represents the best hope for the solution to the problems of our cities. The future of hundreds of American cities are at stake today. We must fulfill our responsibilities to these communities by approving this appropriation.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply disturbed to learn that the Appropriations Committee has recommended a cut of 24 percent in the \$77 million requested by the President for civil defense. The appropriation which continues the shelter program was actually cut even deeper, 54 percent, from \$21.6 million requested by the President to the \$10 million recommended by the Appropriations Committee. If these cuts are allowed to stand, the civil defense appropriation for fiscal year 1969 will be far less than the minimum required to continue the program at the lowest possible sustaining rate.

With Russia's nuclear strength increasing both absolutely and relative to ours, and China developing a nuclear capability at an alarming rate, this is not the time to cut back our strategic defenses.

For a number of years, the Department of Defense has studied the subject of nuclear attack and defense. As a result of intensive inquiries into this subject, both the present civilian and military authorities of our Defense Establishment, and their predecessors, reached agreement on the importance of a fallout shelter program to our strategic defense, and the protection of our military manpower and civilian population.

This country is now going ahead with the installation of an anti-ballistic-missile system which, together with fallout shelters, would save tens of millions of lives. The cost of the shelter program is relatively small, yet this is where the cuts in the appropriation have been the most severe.

The Federal civil defense program and the cooperating State and local civil defense organizations have already proven their worth in the many natural and man-caused disasters that have affected almost every State in the Union during the past few years.

If the cut in civil defense funds is allowed to remain, the Federal, State, and local civil defense organizations will be seriously weakened, and our people will suffer.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge that the restoration of the full amount requested for civil defense.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask support today for appropriations for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development as reported to us by the Appropriations Committee. In view of the heavy demands on our budget this year, the committee was obliged to make reductions in the amounts requested. I ask you to accept its judgment and pass this bill which so vitally affects the well-being of our urban areas. I would call to your attention two

items which I consider of crucial importance in our effort to meet the needs of our cities—both large and small—the request for the promising model cities program, and the request for rent supplements.

The model cities program has brought a new ray of hope into the lives of slum dwellers and into the lives of city administrators who are trying to meet their needs. This program offers the opportunity for a city to pull together and coordinate the full range of urban aids to upgrade large blighted areas. Emphasis on coordination and local flexibility will cut out the waste caused by fragmentation and insure a greater return on the Federal dollar. We cannot afford to snuff out the hope and enthusiasm alive in the 75 cities now planning for the program and the 70 other cities that will be named this year. I ask you to vote for the \$400 million requested for program grants and the \$100 million asked for urban renewal projects in model cities.

Also vital to the model cities and to other urban areas is the rent supplement appropriation. Our appropriations for this program last year were painfully inadequate. At a time when 20 million Americans are living in substandard housing, this program offers us an opportunity to combine Federal subsidy with the efforts of the private sector to meet the housing needs of low-income families. Thirteen thousand units have already been built under this program; private and nonprofit sponsors are lined up waiting to build more. Give them that chance, vote for the full \$25 million rent supplement appropriation.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, we are considering today appropriations for Housing and Urban Development for the coming fiscal year. The Appropriations Committee has already done the most difficult job of trimming the original requests and given us a lean, but solid bill that would enable us to meet the most urgent needs in urban areas. I would particularly call your attention to the provisions for two of the most promising urban aid programs in recent years—the model cities program and rent supplements.

Both of these programs represent innovative approaches to the hard core problems of inner city areas and provide maximum opportunity for using the talents of the private sector.

Seventy-five cities of various sizes across the country are now drawing up a 1-year action program and a 5-year plan for a concentrated attack on the physical, social, and economic problems of blighted neighborhoods. Another 70 cities will receive model cities planning grants this year. The key to the model cities program—the element that makes it so useful is not just the possibility of extra Federal funds, for actually model cities funds are only a small percentage of Federal money already available. The key is that the cities themselves will have the chance to produce a program to meet their individual needs, and to try new ideas.

At the same time the model cities approach eliminates the fragmentation and overlapping that has too long dissipated urban efforts. The result will be a more

effective local effort and a better use of the Federal urban aid dollar. The \$400 million in model cities supplemental funds and the \$100 million for urban renewal projects in model neighborhoods proposed in this bill are sound investments in the future of urban America.

Rent supplements is a unique means for involving the private sector in providing the huge amount of low-income housing needed in this country. It is flexible because it supplements income until the family can afford to pay the market rate for decent housing on its own. Despite our shabby treatment of this program in the past, it has already provided decent housing for 13,000 low-income families. I would point out to you that the appropriations figure for rent supplements now before Congress, calls for a 60-percent reduction over the original request. At a time when 10 percent of our population are living in substandard homes, I ask you to vote the full \$25 million for this program.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in support of H.R. 17023, the Independent Offices and Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill of 1969, as reported out by the House Appropriations Committee. Although this appropriation does not include the expansion in the housing program set forth in this year's authorization bill, it is a critical program and must be supported.

The city of Cleveland is moving forward on a "Cleveland Now" program which depends very much on the outcome of the Housing and Urban Development appropriation.

This legislation appropriates \$1½ billion for the model cities program of which \$200 million will go to the 70 cities already in the program.

The hopes of our community hinge on the \$200 million reserve for additional cities. The remaining \$100 million in the bill is allocated to complete urban renewal programs around the Nation.

The proposal provides \$25 million for additional rent supplement programs, \$15 million above last year's program. While this annual outlay appears modest, it does provide for an annual commitment for the 30- or 40-year life of a rent supplement guarantee. Thus, a \$25 million commitment over a 40-year period could become a total commitment of a billion dollars in the life of the program.

The revitalization of Cleveland depends critically on the adoption of the recent supplement program which appears to be the best way of involving the leadership and partnership of private enterprise in the rebuilding of our cities.

Although the city of Cleveland is a prime beneficiary of this appropriation, almost every municipality in the metropolitan area is involved and vitally affected by the outcome of this legislation which provides help to most of the communities in the metropolitan area. We must resist the attack of those who are indifferent to urban problems which threaten every metropolitan area.

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the HUD appropriations, fiscal year 1969, now before us. I submit that it is especially vital for this House to

support full funding for the model cities and rent supplements programs. Any further cuts in these two programs, I believe, would seriously hamper constructive efforts being made at the local level in attacking the desperate problems of the slums. Anything but full funding would also be contrary to, and fly in the face of, the findings of the Commission on Civil Disorders.

The results of the uniquely devised model cities program have yet to be felt, simply because the program has not had time to be implemented. But I am convinced this highly promising plan for our cities, large and small, can make real headway given a chance.

The Model Cities Act was one of the first pieces of legislation to call for maximum participation of private enterprise in the effort to rebuild our cities. The skills and resources of our greatest national asset—private enterprise—have been enlisted in the model cities program, and should be given our support.

The mustering of talent, all the leadership that a community can command, was a strong factor, I believe, in the decision by HUD to award a model cities planning grant to the city of Cohoes in my district.

I recently received, Mr. Chairman, a letter from Paul G. Van Buskirk, director of the model cities agency for the city of Cohoes.

The letter from Mr. Van Buskirk emphasized that—

An important concept of the Model Cities Program is involving the people being served, in the development and execution of the program.

And, he says:

We have realized that one of the basic reasons why past programs have not had the effect they should is that we did not fully understand the needs and effects on the area the program was to serve.

The former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and now chairman of the Urban Coalition, said it another way in an article appearing in the May 6 issue of the New York Times, asserting that stability in American cities would not be established "until we bring into the same conversation all significant leadership elements that hold power or veto power in the life of the community."

Mr. Chairman, the model cities program embraces this concept fully. In fact, it is weighted heavily as a criterion in approval of a planning grant application.

Mr. Van Buskirk makes an impressively detailed case, Mr. Chairman. He described the historical and unfortunate lack of attention given to our growing cities over the past 60 years, and the need for concentrated effort now to avoid greater cost in the future. He points to the model cities requirement of coordinating presently fragmented programs to produce better results. He calls for our Nation to accept a strong position of world leadership in solving domestic problems. And in urging that the full appropriation for model cities be approved, he states that—

Many public and private agencies have participated in programs in the past, but have

become frustrated when they were not fully funded or when the appropriation was insufficient to make any impact in solving problems.

Because Mr. Van Buskirk's letter makes such good sense, and because it raises questions critical to the direction our country is taking in facing up to our domestic problems, I am inserting it in the RECORD at this point and commend it to the close attention of all Members of this House:

CITY OF COHOES, N.Y.,

May 3, 1968.

HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON,
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BUTTON: I have recently read that the House of Representatives will consider the appropriation for the Model Cities Program on May 8, 1968. I wish to take this opportunity to inform you of the effect I believe this important appropriation will have on the City of Cohoes, a recipient of a Model City Planning Grant, and all other cities throughout the nation, as well as the nation itself.

The problems that face our cities today are the result of a lack of foresight, and the lack of concern of society and our political subdivisions over the past 40 to 60 years. While our cities were growing and being maintained, we failed to take action in the fields of air pollution, water pollution, water resources, city planning, zoning, housing and building codes, education, job training, health, social and physical rehabilitation, housing, civil rights, equal opportunities and several others. Over the years these problems grew, and became so interrelated, that it has even become difficult to analyze them. Today, the only means of solving them is the complete mobilization of all public and private resources, each sharing in the responsibility not only to correct these problems, but to maintain the machinery to see that they do not reoccur. Unfortunately, these difficult problems emerge today as national problems that affect the entire nation. The cost of a solution today is many times what it would have been 40 or 60 years ago. I believe this nation is honest enough to admit its shortcomings and make a concentrated effort today to eliminate some of its ills, so that future generations will not be burdened with a cost that will be much greater than that which we face at the present.

Prior to the Model Cities Program, our federal government did with foresight, and a strong sense of awareness, provide programs to solve some of our national problems. Some of these programs are social security, urban renewal, housing, water pollution control, health, education and several others. In most cases these programs were fragmented while our problems are interrelated. One of the concepts of the Model Cities Program is to coordinate the present fragmented programs economically, physically and socially, so that they will produce more effective and efficient results in solving our national problems. I believe we will find that coordinating the present programs under the Model Cities Program will increase their productivity immeasurably.

In the City of Cohoes many of these programs are presently being developed but have not been executed. These programs are: Urban Renewal, Code Enforcement, Demolition, Housing, Neighborhood Facilities, Water Pollution Control.

We now have the opportunity under the Model Cities Program to show that the programs can be effectively and efficiently implemented under Model Cities and will have a greater impact on social and physical rehabilitation, business and industry, employment, physical environment as well as the sound development of our city.

The Model Cities concept also realizes that every community has different problems or different approaches to solving similar problems. This gives communities the opportunity to develop programs that do not exist and may only apply to the needs of their particular community.

Another important concept of the Model Cities Program is involving the people being served, in the development and execution of the program. We have realized that one of the basic reasons why past programs have not had the effect they should is that we did not fully understand the needs and effects on the area the program was to serve. In implementing the Model Cities Program, our country will demonstrate its ability to mobilize all resources and all segments of society will accept their responsibilities in solving our national problems.

We must also consider the fact that our nation has accepted its position as a world leader and we must be able to set an example to the rest of the world in our leadership and capability in openly solving our domestic problems. At this time, we should close ranks to demonstrate this important example.

We only have to read the recommendation of the report of the President's Commission on Civil Disorders to understand the immediate importance of implementing these recommendations and of extending our energies in solving these difficult problems.

Many public and private agencies have participated in programs in the past, but have become frustrated when they were not fully funded or when the appropriation was insufficient to make any impact in solving problems. It is essential, in order for the Model Cities Program to be successful, that the full appropriation before the House be approved.

Out of the greatest concern for our nation and our community, I am requesting on behalf of the people of Cohoes, that you, as our Congressman, use all of your influence, energies and efforts to obtain approval for the full appropriation for the Model Cities Program.

Yours truly,

PAUL G. VANBUSKIRK,
Director.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, this bill before us, H.R. 17023, is both of unusual scope and complexity, covering, as it does, recommended appropriations for some 20 independent executive agencies and offices and the vitally important Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The distinguished Chairman and the esteemed Appropriation Committee members truly deserve the full gratitude of this body for their dedication and diligence in preparing this bill, and the able managers of both sides merit our unanimous appreciation for their studied and painstaking efforts to clearly explain the meaning and effect of the provisions in this bill.

I know the measure, in its entirety, will be given careful examination by the Members, but I would like to urge that the most concentrated attention and sympathetic consideration be particularly granted to the appropriations suggested for the Department of Housing and Urban Development because I very deeply believe it is of imperative urgency for us to ensure the Department's wholesome program for model cities, urban planning, urban renewal and their related activities be adequately funded for full operation. The committee, I think, made what they felt was a fair compromise recommendation, but it is my

conscientious conviction that a recommendation should have been made and this House should approve, today, the maximum unfunded authorization for the model cities program—\$650 million.

Over the past several weeks our appropriation action today in the model cities area and associated programs has become increasingly significant to the unity of this country and our people since it does reflect the true measure of our response toward curing a disease that is threatening the very foundation of our society.

Whatever varying thoughts we may have about the unhappy violence and destruction that recently occurred in so many cities around the country, I think it is universally and unmistakably clear that this Congress has the grave duty of doing everything in our power to correct, as soon as possible, the underlying causes of this great American tragedy.

The vehicle through which this cure and correction can be most effectively carried out is approval of the full appropriation of urban program assistance to our cities which, without our adequate Federal aid, will be left, like the poor feel themselves to be now, without any hope of help in a vital task, of National interest, that is obviously beyond their individual capacities.

May I further say that inadequate funding action might well become one of the greatest imprudences of modern history since it would undoubtedly generate new and higher despair and frustration among great numbers of our people throughout this Nation.

Let me please remind you that when this Congress passed the original model cities bill, it was making practically an inherently binding promise not just to a comparatively few cities that might come to be afflicted with riots and property destruction, but to all those numerous cities qualified for assistance on the basic grounds of low-income population, adequate housing shortages, and associated standards.

At the present time, hundreds of such cities all over the country have invested much time and overtime of community officials and expert volunteers, together with community money, to apply and be approved for this assistance, and this includes my own home city of Worcester, Mass., which has a nationally recognized reputation for community cooperation, and dedication, and for efficient accomplishment in planning, and fulfillment of development programs. If this House withholds endorsement of full funding for the basically qualified and approved city applicants, it will be tantamount to a contradiction and betrayal of the words and promises that were enacted into law less than a year ago.

Mr. Chairman, I again most earnestly exhort my colleagues here to resoundingly register their approval of the administration's full appropriation request for the model cities program to enable my community, and all other qualified communities, to participate in a humane projection wisely designed to grant all of our citizens of whatever race or color or circumstance the opportunity to rightfully share in our National heritage and

to enable this country to truly fulfill, in domestic tranquility, its destiny of leadership in a world at peace.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Appropriations Committee recommendations for Independent Offices and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. I am particularly concerned with funds recommended for the model cities program and the rent supplement program.

As the President recently said:

America's cities are in crisis. This clear and urgent warning arises from the decay of decades—and is amplified by the harsh realities of the present.

Model cities and rent supplements can act to bring this urban decay to a standstill and to provide the setting for transforming our cities into places of beauty and hospitality.

But this job cannot be done by the Federal Government alone. The decay of our central cities cannot be cured by simply injecting massive doses of Federal money into the heart. Success can only come through a deep involvement and commitment by the private sector in the rehabilitation and redevelopment of our urban cores. Private industry, labor, business, and people must look at America's cities as not only a challenge, but, equally, as a new opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has recommended a total appropriation for model cities of \$500,000,000—\$400 million in supplemental grants and \$100 million for urban renewal connected with the programs. This figure is a cut of \$150 million from authorized funds. However, in the face of a serious budget deficit and other problems with the economy, I feel that this is a realistic and responsible figure. Hopefully, the President's full request can be filled by a supplemental appropriation. The funds recommended by the committee are above last year's level.

The model cities program is designed to show how a city, regardless of size, can be transformed and improved to give its citizens a chance for a better life. It calls for a comprehensive attack on social, economic, and physical problems in selected blighted and slum areas. In New Jersey, three cities have already been approved for planning grants and I am confident that other cities in New Jersey will be named for planning grants in the second generation of the program. Model cities is certainly in the vanguard of the new approach to urban problems.

The rent supplement program stands as a key element of the landmark 1965 Housing and Urban Development Act. It helps to provide decent housing for low-income families without the traditional resort to public housing projects. The program utilizes nonprofit, limited dividend or cooperative associations as housing sponsors. Basically, the rent supplement program provides rental payments to private landlords to supplement the potential rent payable by a low-income family, thereby allowing the low-income family to live in housing which otherwise would be too expensive.

Mr. Chairman, it is estimated that by the year 2000, 40 million more people will be living in our already overcrowded

cities. The facilities of these cities are already overextended and strained to the point of breaking. We must begin now to rejuvenate our cities if we are to not be overtaken by the rush of time and people. I ask my colleagues to vote favorably on these recommended levels of funding.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal today about the problems of many thousands of Americans who have inadequate housing and the need for prompt action to improve the situation.

The Housing and Urban Development Department is said to be searching for new methods of constructing low-cost homes for the poorly housed, even to the extent of spending some \$10 million in research and technical development.

One solution to the problem has already been researched thoroughly by Joel S. Stahl, of Youngstown, Ohio, and has been demonstrated to the satisfaction of all concerned in various other parts of the world. Mr. Stahl's proposal should receive much more serious attention than has yet been given it by HUD officials.

I include for general information an article on this subject which appeared in the Youngstown Vindicator, April 28:

ONE THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED FIFTY DOLLAR HOUSE—LOW-INCOME HOUSING'S SOLUTION?: JOEL STAHL SAYS PLASTIC KEEPS PRICE SO LOW

(By Glenn Morris)

Homes for low-income families, building for the poor, housing for the needy—whatever the label, it has been called the most pressing problem facing the American society.

Joel S. Stahl, a plastics engineer and technical consultant who is international in scope and based in Youngstown, has an idea he thinks can help solve the gigantic task, and he's trying to interest Washington in it.

By combining plastics and other common building materials, Stahl says, it is possible to build a basic one-room house of 200 square feet with all essential equipment and meeting building codes for \$1,250, or a three-bedroom model of 800 square feet for \$3,500, both excluding lot.

This would put home ownership within reach of just about everyone wanting it, he says.

None of the materials nor the system are new. What is new is his idea of using them in concert, he says. Also new is the country's concern to replace slum housing under the leadership of the federal government, with private business' help, and aiming at six million units in the next decade.

SEEKS FEDERAL HELP

Stahl is trying to get his idea aboard the vehicle of federal experimental housing programs. Congressman Frank T. Bow last week was officially miffed because officials of the Department of Housing and Urban Development didn't adopt Stahl's ideas immediately when he presented them in January. Stahl is still trying.

Basic to Stahl's concept is a house consisting of 4-by-8-foot sandwich panels, forming the walls, and joined into modules that, like human body cells, can be clustered to create houses of almost any size.

While many materials will suit, Stahl's demonstration panel consists of two sheets of asbestos cement board one-eighth of an inch thick, separated by insulating plastic foam. The edges are wrapped in aluminum extrusions linked by H-shaped channels. The exterior side is coated with small chipped stones that easily withstand weather and create an attractive, varied appearance. The interior side is printed to resemble wood wall

paneling. The wall is about three inches thick. Stahl's firm, Stahl Industries Inc., has a patent pending on the process for making the sandwich panels.

In the process, electric lines, plumbing, heating and other utility systems are installed in the panels at a factory, where everything is assembled on an automated line, like cars at General Motors' Lordstown plant.

Then the houses are shipped as kits to the site. If the cement slab is ready, four unskilled men can erect the basic house in a day, half the time with some instruction, and occupants can move in the same day.

NOT MUCH INTEREST

Development of the house was taken abroad several years ago by Stahl because Americans weren't much interested in low-cost housing then. "People who needed low-cost housing didn't have the money and those who did weren't interested."

Stahl plunged into the remote, primitive jungle villages of South America to test how the products in his type of house could compete with government housing there. Against the government's structures of cement block and corrugated metal roofs, Stahl found his concept was competitive in price and superior in quality.

In March, Stahl and Ball Bros. Research Corp. demonstrated the ease and swiftness of erecting the house before the minister of housing in Jamaica. The official says the system may help solve his country's critical housing problem.

Today the attitude in the United States toward the need for low-income housing has changed dramatically and the drive to eradicate the slums intensified, Stahl notes. And Stahl says his house, because of its type of construction, will fit needs here as well as in hotter climates of South America and Jamaica, and carry similar prices.

So far, he notes, because of the relatively high cost of so-called "low-cost housing," few of these units will ever help the truly poor. And in conventional houses nowadays \$15,000 buys only the minimum essential, and few are being built.

A few turnkey and rent-supplement projects are geared to eventual ownership he says, but the problem remains, how can home ownership be put within the reach of the truly poor? Stahl argues that his house is the answer.

NO SKILLED HELP

The low price on his type of house is the equivalent of a used car, he points out. For \$1,250 the buyer can have a "starter set" that can be enlarged room by room as he can afford. The simple assembly makes the house a "do-it-yourself kit," he says; no skilled help is required on the site, to erect it.

Builders could hire unskilled people to work on home erection, thus easing the unemployment problem, Stahl says. Skilled tradesmen would work in plants making the housing kits, using their skills as they do now at conventional sites. But in the plant efficiency would rise and working time would be divorced from the weather, which is a major factor in outdoor production now. Buyers would gain the pride of home ownership that can change many attitudes.

Stahl says his answer to low-income housing would take the full apparatus of the housing industry—government, private developers, builders, cities, unions, etc. He envisions a public-private enterprise corporation, such as Comsat for space communications.

"So far," Stahl says, "housing programs have only brought a baffling welter of funds, agencies, bureaus, offices . . . but little housing. Why not a simple 'do it yourself' house package? Why not provide the necessary housing components to insure that a house can be built, if a man really wants one? Instead of trying to train inexperienced men in skills that may be beyond them (why not)

provide them with something simple enough that they can handle?

"This way, adequate housing could be produced in large numbers at controlled cost. A man could build his house shell with parts provided. He could complete the house to his taste at his leisure. Labor, private enterprise and government would be cooperating in a common task.

"In many places, this would restore the dignity of man of the house. He would then have a better chance to properly influence the minds of his young and train them to be responsible citizens. This is everybody's problem, everywhere, and time will not wait forever for the solution."

Plastics' use in housing has been Stahl's major concern since his firm began making mouldings here in 1950. He was born here, had attended South and Wilson high schools before graduating from Warren's Warren G. Harding High in 1935. He took a chemistry degree at Ohio State University in 1939, then joined Ashland Oil. In 1959 when Wasco Chemical Corp. bought his firm's plant, the company turned to specializing in technical marketing studies and production consulting. It has a staff of 15 with offices at 1200 Realty Building on Central Square and an international operation. Stahl, who is president, has been on two trade missions for the U.S. Department of Commerce, to Belgium in 1963 and the South Caribbean in 1966.

Among his clients have been Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corp., Stauffer Chemical, Johns-Mansville, Koppers Co. and Mitsubishi International of Japan.

Stahl has a film available on erection of his type of housing in the Jamaica demonstration. He will explain the system to the Society of Plastics Engineers May 8 in New York.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, the dual forces of blight and decay, nurtured by decades of apathy and disregard, have been the greatest contributors to what we now call the crisis of our cities. To overcome this crisis our efforts must be directed not only toward removing physical deterioration but also human deprivation.

As President Johnson has so correctly noted:

The cry of the city, reduced to its essentials, is the cry of a man for his sense of place and purpose.

So the task ahead is not as simple as constructing new buildings. It is good education, it is employment, it is decent housing. But let us not use the immensity of the task as an excuse for inaction.

We have made a significant beginning on reversing the trends of human and physical blight—the model cities program.

Today, over 70 communities throughout the Nation are making plans with model cities grants to rebuild decaying neighborhoods. Another 164 have applied for planning grants so they too can offer a better future for their citizens.

Unless we in Congress are willing to provide adequate funding for the model cities program, many communities—those with planning efforts now underway and those with applications pending—will be disappointed.

The struggle of these cities to reclaim blighted neighborhoods will have reached a barrier. We cannot let their efforts go unfulfilled. We cannot tell them that this Congress is unconcerned with their problems. We cannot turn away from the consequences of years of disinterest and disregard. Time has forged ahead

too rapidly while the pace of action has moved too slowly.

I urge my colleagues to join with me today in support of adequate funds for the model cities program. It is in the best interest of every community, every State and of this Nation.

SUMMARY OF BUDGET AUTHORITY AND EXPENDITURE REDUCTIONS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, this is the third regular appropriation bill of the session. The bill as reported from committee carries total new budget obligational authority—appropriations, essentially—of about \$13.7 billion and represents a reduction of \$2.9 billion below the budget requests.

The other two regular appropriation bills which the House has passed at this session—Treasury-Post Office and Agriculture—were also reduced below the budget requests. I will place in the RECORD at this point a table showing that the reductions to date on the three bills, including the one before us today, total \$4.482 billion in new budget authority. The estimated impact on budget expenditures for 1969 would be a reduction of about \$900 million, more or less, depending to some degree on just how the budget programs for the many items affected by the obligational reductions are precisely adjusted to comply.

The summary table follows:

NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY AND ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE REDUCTIONS IN FISCAL YEAR 1969
APPROPRIATION BILLS

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year 1969 bill	New budget authority				Budget expenditures estimated reductions ¹	
	Considered		Reductions		Amount	Cumulative
	Amount	Cumulative	Amount	Cumulative		
Treasury-Post Office.....	1,959.5	1,959.5	-181.7	-181.7	-132.2	-132.2
Agriculture.....	6,924.0	8,883.5	-1,400.3	-1,582.0	-414.1	-546.3
Independent offices-HUD (committee bill).....	16,570.6	25,454.1	-2,900.0	-4,482.0	-360.0	-906.3

¹ Tentative calculation; subject to same refinement.

In the budget authority reductions of \$4.482 billion made to date, \$2.535 billion is represented by a reduction in participation certificate sales authority which, in the new budget, serves to augment the available budget authority. This new obligational authority did not increase budget expenditures for fiscal 1969, and its deletion from the budget will not reduce budget expenditures. But the reduction does reduce new budget—obligational authority—and does have a direct impact on the carryover into future years. It reduces what is commonly called the "pipeline" of unused, carryover obligational authority.

Aside from the participation certificates reduction, the reductions in the bill today are \$790 million.

On the three bills, aside from the participation certificates reductions of \$2.535 billion, the reductions total \$1.947 billion in new budget—obligation—authority.

Mr. Chairman, on last Wednesday, the House Committee on Appropriations recommended a package looking to a total reduction by Congress below the budget requests for new budget authority for fiscal 1969, of not less than \$10 billion, and a total reduction in budgeted 1969 expenditures of not less than \$4 billion. These reductions would be from the 1969 Budget as submitted by the President to Congress last January. Certain limited exceptions were noted. The package also recommended a study looking to rescissions from unused carryover authority of not less than \$8 billion.

THE PROBLEM OF ECONOMY AND RESTRAINT

It is easy, and there is a tendency, for Members of Congress and members of the press generally to talk somewhat glibly about vast reductions in appropriations and in expenditures. It is easy to do this if the figures are picked out of the air, so to speak, and are not related to specific items of appropriations for

projects and programs included in the budget.

Making the targets of \$10 billion reduction in new budget authority and the \$4 billion reduction in expenditures is not going to be easy. It will require much effort and some sacrifices, some foregoing of items desired by many Members. It may even be impossible to achieve the agreement of a majority of the Members of Congress on both sides of the Capitol to make these reductions. We will hope not.

We must bear in mind that House action is not the only factor to be considered. Action by the other body is also required. Very often, specific reductions made in the House are restored in the other body and very often the House, in the conference meetings, is compelled to acquiesce in part to the demands of the other body.

In discussing reductions in appropriations and expenditures, we must be careful not to talk about overall figures grabbed from the air, so to speak, without also thinking about the realities of legislation and keep in mind that reductions must come to rest against specific items, specific projects and programs, when the knife is applied. There is no such thing as economy in the abstract, but only in the specific.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CONGRESS

Another thing to which I think I should make reference is this: There are some Members who freely concede that Congress itself would not reduce fiscal 1969 appropriations, shall we say, by \$14 billion, and fiscal 1969 expenditures by \$6 billion, but who are inclined to say that the reductions can more or less easily be made by the executive branch of the Government. This is a great oversimplification. Since when has the executive branch come upon some magic, easy, painless way to economize that has

escaped the legislative branch? No; it has not. It is likewise difficult for the executive branch to make meaningful reductions. There is no painless, royal road to sharp reductions in spending.

We could all freely admit that a Member from an agricultural district might say that the Congress can, with relative ease, make reductions in expenditures and appropriations at the level of the highest figure suggested by eliminating or drastically curtailing programs which do not relate to a rural district. Likewise, a Member from a highly urbanized district might favor a program of reductions that would eliminate or drastically curtail programs which apply to non-urban areas. Approaching our fiscal decisions on any such basis would be sheer nonsense. Some balance, some compromise course is the only practical procedure.

Manifestly, reductions can only be accomplished by a majority of those voting in the House and in the other body. Reductions firmly supported by the Democratic leadership would have a better chance of acceptance than those not so supported. By the same token, reductions supported by the leadership of the minority party would have a better chance of adoption than if minority party support is unavailable.

For example, in the bill before us today, if the minority party, speaking reasonably for the minority position, wishes to submit amendments for reductions in the pending bill below reductions already made by the Committee on Appropriations, it is, of course, entirely in order to submit such amendments, and today is the day to offer any such amendments and test the sentiment of both the minority and majority on the issues involved. Of course, all Members are free to offer amendments.

Personally, I do not advocate amendments to increase or decrease the pending bill. I think the Committee on Appropriations, in the light of all the circumstances, has done a good job in working out a reasonably acceptable compromise and I would hope that majority and minority Members would support the compromise which this bill represents.

My only object in undertaking to clarify the situation is to make clear what I believe to be the most appropriate way to reduce appropriations and expenditures to the extent that the Congress as a whole may desire. It is the traditional way of putting the imprint of the Congress on the spending policies of the Government. It is our duty to decide how much shall be appropriated, and for what it shall be appropriated.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think it will be possible to secure the approval of Congress for a \$6 billion reduction in expenditures and a \$14 billion reduction in new appropriations, as has been variously discussed. As I have said, in my judgment making the \$10 billion goal and the \$4 billion goal will not be easy.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, I have voted against the authorization of many of the expensive and escalating programs which are now on the statute books, including several funded in the present bill. I am one who speaks from a position of re-

straint and economy in Government. But I cannot blind myself to the facts and realities of the situation. I know I cannot write the fiscal ticket altogether to suit my own views. No one Member can do that. But my plea is for fiscal sanity and commonsense and prudence in dealing with the issues before us.

We are in a very serious inflationary period. The dollar is under challenge at home and abroad. The budget is badly in the red—well in excess of \$20 billion this year and perhaps as much as \$25 billion next year without a tax bill. In these circumstances, the duty of economy and restraint is just not debatable.

THE BUDGET TOTALS IN PERSPECTIVE

Mr. Chairman, when we consider reductions of billions of dollars in appropriations and expenditures we must, for good perspective, also consider the general dollar dimensions of the areas from which those reductions must principally come.

NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY

As to new—obligational—authority, the January budget request is \$201.7 billion, and only a 5-percent reduction—not a large percentage—would yield the \$10 billion reduction goal recently recommended by the Committee on Appropriations. In that sense, \$10 billion does not look to be a drastic reduction. But actually, the reduction of \$10 billion would have to come from areas involving considerably less than \$201.7 billion. I will insert a summary table that puts the \$201.7 billion amount in some better focus in this respect, but perhaps the first thing to be said is that only about \$141.5 billion of the \$201.7 billion proposed for 1969 is required to be acted upon in bills at this session of Congress. Amounts for interest on the debt, social security, Federal retirement, and various other items will become available in fiscal 1969 on the basis of permanent appropriation provisions enacted in earlier years. Those exceed \$60 billions of dollars.

Furthermore, as a very hard, practical matter, large areas of the \$201.7 billion new—obligational—authority total involve objects and purposes very much fixed by provisions of various basic laws and thus are subject to very little discretionary control in the annual appropriation bills. Of course, Congress could change the basic laws and, for examples, drastically reduce social security, or public assistance grants, or various other programs. But there seems to be no likelihood that existing basic statutes will be repealed or revised downward to a meaningful degree if at all.

Let me be more specific.

Social security, medicare, and other so-called social insurance trust funds—funds held in trust—account for \$46.1 billion of the \$201.7 billion new budget—obligational—authority request.

Interest on the debt accounts for \$14.4 billion.

Veterans' pensions, compensations, and benefits amount to \$5.4 billion.

Public assistance matching grants under formulas set out in the basic laws are listed at \$5.8 billion.

Farm price supports are basically determined under agricultural legislation,

and they show up at \$3.4 billion. The basic laws under certain conditions require price supports on certain farm production.

The July 1968 pay increase installment provided for military and civilian employees in the pay act last fall is in the budget for 1969 at \$1.6 billion.

Just the few items cited, Mr. Chairman, add to more than \$75 billion.

Then, for national defense as classified in the budget, the January figure for new budget authority is \$82.3 billion. Some reductions can be made, but drastic cuts are not in the realm of reality under present conditions.

It can easily be seen, then, that a good deal of the \$10 billion reduction goal must come from a relatively narrow, or much smaller, slice of the \$201.7 billion total.

Under leave to extend, I will include further statistics on this aspect:

NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY, FISCAL 1969

[From January budget, in billions of dollars]

	Amount
1. National defense.....	\$82.3
2. Relatively uncontrollable civilian programs (that is, relatively uncontrollable through the annual budget and appropriations prices without changes in the applicable basic laws), open-ended programs and fixed costs:	
Social security, medicare, and other social insurance trust funds.....	46.1
Interest.....	14.4
Civilian and military pay increase.....	1.6
Veterans pensions, compensation, and benefits.....	5.4
Public assistance grants.....	5.8
Farm price supports (Commodity Credit Corporation).....	3.4
Postal operations.....	.3
Legislative and judiciary.....	.4
Other.....	3.5
Subtotal, defense and relatively uncontrollable civilian programs.....	163.2
3. Relatively controllable civilian programs.....	43.6
4. Undistributed intragovernmental payments (—).....	—5.0
Total, new budget authority proposed, 1969..	\$201.7

¹ Of which \$141,500,000,000 of this normally requires action by Congress at this session. (See table 5 of Budget for 1969.) The remainder would become available under provisions of various laws previously enacted (i.e., permanent appropriations for interest on debt, social security, and other trust funds, etc.).

Mr. Chairman, the \$201.7 billion total of new budget—obligational—authority

proposed in the January budget represents an increase of about \$15.2 billion over the total projected for the current fiscal year 1968, of which about \$2.1 billion relates to funds that would become available without current action by Congress. The remaining \$13.1 billion increase is in areas requiring action this session. I include a summary that puts some focus to the significance of the \$10 billion reduction goal in relation to the current year base amounts:

NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATING) AUTHORITY PROPOSED IN THIS BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1969 OVER FISCAL YEAR 1968 (ROUNDED AMOUNTS USED)

Item	Fiscal year 1969 compared to fiscal year 1968
Available through current action by the Congress:	
Department of Defense and military assistance program (excludes defense share of the \$1,600,000,000 pay increment effective July 1, 1968, listed below).....	+\$6,200,000,000
Public assistance and payments to the medicare trust fund.....	+586,000,000
Foreign economic assistance.....	+597,000,000
Federal manpower activities (civilian agencies).....	+442,000,000
Office of Economic Opportunity (excluding manpower activities).....	+163,000,000
Atomic Energy Commission (largely new antiballistic missiles system).....	+245,000,000
Model cities program (full funding).....	+688,000,000
Military and civilian pay raises (July 1, 1968 increment under last year's pay bill).....	+1,600,000,000
Later transmittal (pending enactment of proposed legislation, including \$445,000,000 for investments in certain international financial institutions).....	+700,000,000
Contingencies.....	+400,000,000
All other (consisting of many increases and decreases).....	+1,475,000,000
Total increase through current action by the Congress.....	¹ +13,096,000,000
Available without current action by the Congress:	
Trust funds (principally social security).....	+3,900,000,000
Interest on the debt.....	+900,000,000
Other.....	—1,659,000,000
Deduct interfund and intragovernmental transactions and applicable receipts from the public.....	—1,013,000,000
Total, increase without current action by the Congress.....	¹ +2,138,000,000
Total, budget authority increase..	¹ +15,224,000,000

¹ Based on January budget totals.

BUDGET AUTHORITY REQUIRING CURRENT ACTION BY CONGRESS

[In millions of dollars]

Description	1967 enacted	1968 estimate			1969 estimate		
		Enacted	Supplemental needed	Total	Transmitted herein	Later transmittal	Total
Legislative Branch.....	271	277	4	282	306	—	306
The Judiciary.....	90	94	1	95	101	1	102
Executive Office of the President.....	29	31	(*)	31	33	—	33
Funds appropriated to the President.....	5,112	4,718	10	4,728	5,763	566	6,329
Department of Agriculture.....	7,734	6,411	52	6,463	7,300	7	7,307
Department of Commerce.....	873	763	8	771	825	—	825
Department of Defense—Military.....	71,943	72,112	800	72,912	79,182	75	79,257
Department of Defense—Civil.....	1,391	1,383	11	1,394	1,345	—	1,345
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.....	12,617	12,858	1,604	14,463	15,305	83	15,388
Department of Housing and Urban Development.....	6,402	3,330	25	3,356	3,387	40	3,427
Department of the Interior.....	1,586	1,592	29	1,621	1,724	—	1,724
Department of Justice.....	408	417	47	465	465	80	545
Department of Labor.....	638	625	29	654	730	11	742
Post Office Department.....	1,215	962	212	1,174	920	—	920
Department of State.....	395	389	1	390	418	—	418
Department of Transportation.....	6,204	1,511	221	1,732	2,736	85	2,821
Treasury Department.....	931	921	13	934	1,016	—	1,016
Atomic Energy Commission.....	2,199	2,509	—	2,509	2,755	—	2,755
General Services Administration.....	656	570	4	574	509	—	509
National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	4,968	4,589	—	4,589	4,370	—	4,370
Veterans' Administration.....	6,598	7,499	76	7,575	7,528	9	7,537

Footnote at end of table.

BUDGET AUTHORITY REQUIRING CURRENT ACTION BY CONGRESS—Continued
[In millions of dollars]

Description	1967 enacted	1968 estimate			1969 estimate		
		Enacted	Supplemental needed	Total	Transmitted herein	Later transmittal	Total
Other independent agencies.....	3,174	1,510	28	1,538	1,642	30	1,672
Allowances for:							
Civilian and military pay increase.....						1,600	1,600
Contingencies.....			150	150		550	550
Total, budget authority requiring current action by Congress.....	135,432	125,073	3,327	128,400	138,359	3,136	141,496

*Less than \$500,000.

Source: Table 5, budget for 1969.

BUDGET OUTLAYS (EXPENDITURES AND NET LENDING)

Mr. Chairman, to many who are not familiar with the size and character of the many items making up the January budget spending total of \$186.1 billion, it would seem that the \$4 billion expenditure reduction goal recently recommended by the Committee on Appropriations is too low. It is equivalent to only slightly more than 2 percent. But because expenditures—disbursements—are the inevitable consequence of obligations incurred, and as I have indicated, great portions of the obligational authority budget are insulated from effective control at the appropriations stage, it follows, as night follows day, that much of the spending total of \$186.1 billion for 1969 is beyond practical reach of effective reduction in the annual appropriations process.

To begin with, some \$55 billion is estimated to flow from authority granted for prior years. Moreover, much of the total is more or less rigidly fixed and ordained by provisions of basic legislation, and unless those laws are repealed or revised, there is little discretionary control that can be exercised in the annual appropriation bills. Thus, as a hard, practical matter, the \$4 billion must fall against areas of drastically less dollar magnitude than \$186.1 billion.

Let me be more specific:

Social security, medicare, and other so-called social insurance trust funds—funds held in trust—account for \$38.5 billion of the \$186.1 billion January budget expenditure estimate.

Interest on the debt accounts for \$14.4 billion.

Veterans pensions, compensations, and benefits amount to \$5.2 billion.

Public assistance matching grants under formulas set out in the basic laws are listed at \$5.7 billion.

Farm price supports are basically determined under agricultural legislation, and they show up at \$2.9 billion.

The July 1968 pay increase installment provided for military and civilian employees in the pay act last fall is in the budget for 1969 at \$1.6 billion.

Just these few items, Mr. Chairman, total some \$68 billion.

Then, for national defense as classified in the January budget, the total is about \$80 billion. We can work on that to some extent, and effect some savings, but not drastic reductions. But even that

total, according to the President's statement on March 31, will be revised upward by some \$2.5 billion.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, the \$4 billion expenditure reduction would of necessity fall principally, though not entirely, against programs and projects for which expenditures are estimated at approximately \$40 billion in 1969.

Another way to measure the depth of a \$4 billion expenditure reduction is to

compare it against the \$10.4 billion increase in estimated expenditures, 1969 over 1968, shown in the January budget. Let me list some summary figures:

Estimated expenditure increase, 1969 over 1968 (January budget)

	Billion
Trust funds, net (social security, etc.)	+\$2.6
Vietnam war costs (does not reflect comparison of March 31 updates)	+1.3
July 1968 pay increase under previous legislation	+1.6
Interest on debt and public assistance grants	+1.4
Subtotal	+6.9
All other items, both defense and civilian (consisting of many pluses and minuses)	+3.5
Total	+10.4

¹ Thus, in great measure, a \$4 billion expenditure reduction would fall against projects and programs involved in this net total—and thus, in the aggregate, would mean a slight net reduction below the fiscal 1968 total.

I include a table on this matter from the budget for 1969:

BUDGET OUTLAYS (EXPENDITURES AND NET LENDING)
[Fiscal years, in billions]

Type of controllability	1967 actual	1968 estimate	1969 estimate	Change, 1968 to 1969
National defense	\$70.1	\$76.5	\$79.8	+\$3.3
Relatively uncontrollable civilian programs (that is, through the appropriations process):				
Open-ended programs and fixed costs:				
Social security, Medicare, and other social insurance trust funds.....	30.3	34.3	38.5	+4.2
Interest.....	12.5	13.5	14.4	+.9
Civilian and military pay increase.....			1.6	+1.6
Veterans pensions, compensation, and insurance.....	4.9	5.1	5.2	+.1
Public assistance grants.....	4.2	5.2	5.7	+.5
Farm price supports (Commodity Credit Corporation).....	1.7	2.8	2.9	+.1
Postal operations.....	.8	.7	.3	-.4
Legislative and judiciary.....	.3	.4	.4	(1)
Other.....	2.4	2.7	2.8	+.1
Subtotal, relatively uncontrollable civilian programs.....	57.1	64.7	71.8	+7.1
Relatively controllable civilian programs, including outlays from prior year contracts and obligations.....	35.2	39.0	39.5	+.5
Undistributed intragovernmental payments (—).....	-4.0	-4.6	-5.0	-.5
Total budget outlays.....	158.4	175.6	186.1	+10.4

¹ Less than \$50,000,000.

APPROPRIATION BILLS YET TO BE REPORTED

Mr. Chairman, I think I can say to the House that in the remaining appropriation bills this year, the Committee on Appropriations, consistent with the announced goals, will bend every effort to make reductions wherever reasonably possible.

We have yet to consider the Labor-HEW bill, involving estimates of new budget authority of \$18.1 billion.

The public works bill, which carries a request of \$4.9 billion, including \$2.8 billion for atomic energy. I should point out with respect to the public works bill that if we abandoned all new project starts the savings in appropriation for 1969 would only be about \$27 million with consequent savings in spending for 1969 of some \$15 million. It does not seem to me very wise for Congress or the executive branch to stop public works projects already well underway and incur the waste and the charge of mismanagement which would undoubtedly

ensue. It is not realistic to talk glibly about cutting public works, the so-called pork barrel bill, by hundreds of millions of dollars in the light of the facts which confront us. I do think, however, that we can make significant reductions in that bill.

The foreign aid bill is yet to be considered. Last year's appropriations for foreign assistance was \$2.3 billion, the lowest ever. The House has not, of course, yet acted on the reauthorization bill. The appropriation request for 1969 is \$2.9 billion. There is no doubt that the committee will recommend and the House will approve very sharp cuts in foreign aid.

The Interior appropriation bill is the next bill scheduled to be reported. It involves about \$1.4 billion of requests. Manifestly, this bill cannot be reduced by hundreds of millions of dollars, but many reductions will be made.

The bill for State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary involves requests of

some \$2.2 billion. Some savings can be made.

Other bills which will later come before us include the Transportation bill, the legislative bill, the District of Columbia bill, and the military construction bill.

The major bill this session, appropriation-wise, is, of course, the annual Department of Defense appropriation bill. The January budget authority request for Defense, including the war, is \$77.1 billion. There is no doubt but that a supplemental involving several billions of dollars will be before the Congress. The regular bill is scheduled for consideration by the House in late June. It is not feasible at the moment to project with any assurance what decreases or increases the Congress may decide to make in military spending before the session concludes.

Last year, in the regular defense appropriation bill for 1968, the Congress made reductions in the total sum of \$1.6 billion. I would hope that very substantial reductions can be made this year, but it is not possible to now pinpoint what may develop.

Mr. Chairman, my purpose in making these remarks is to lend some focus to the nature of the fiscal problem confronting us and to express a word of caution with respect to what Congress may be able to do in the way of appropriation and expenditure reductions during the current session. I earnestly hope that the goals which the Committee on Appropriations set on May 1 may be achieved. I would hope that we can do better, but we have a monumental task before us and we need to stay close to reality so that the chances for success in our efforts to promote economy may be enhanced.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board, including hire of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902);

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am intrigued by the representation allowances in this bill. The Civil Aeronautics Board, for instance, gets \$1,000 but the Federal Communications Commission gets \$500, and the Federal Power Commission gets \$500. Then we turn over to NASA, and there is \$35,000 for extraordinary expenses of some kind or another. Then we drop down to the National Science Foundation, and there is \$2,500 for representation allowance.

My question is: Do they eat better food and drink better booze in the scientific organizations, or what is the story as to this wide disparity in entertainment funds?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will say to my friend, the National Science Foundation has a lot of international conferences on tracking stations, where countries allow us to have tracking stations within their countries. This is not for entertainment, as the gentleman inferred.

This is for conferences. Also, the Administrator must have some flexibility in making contracts for scientists and specialists in special fields. The National Science Foundation fund does not relate to what the gentleman referred.

The Federal Aviation Agency and the Civil Aeronautics Board have conferences with respect to schedules of air lines of other countries, of the carriers, and rates, and with respect to flights. It is necessary for these agencies to have some funds to meet our friends from other countries, with which we have agreements.

Mr. GROSS. I do not travel in foreign countries, but I am told by those who do that liquor is a good deal cheaper over there. I still do not understand why there should be this wide difference in funds for entertainment.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. These representation allowances are kept to a very minimum, I say to my friend.

Mr. GROSS. In view of the austerity which is being talked about so much, I thought perhaps we might get a bill with this sort of thing eliminated altogether, but apparently that is a vain hope.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in performing the duties of the Commission as authorized by law, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902); not to exceed \$41,000 for land and structures; not to exceed \$11,000 for improvement and care of grounds and repairs to buildings; not to exceed \$500 for official reception and representation expenses; special counsel fees; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; and purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only, \$19,750,000.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, for several years we have been carrying on a discussion, in respect to the preparation of the budget for the Federal Communications Commission, relative to spectrum reallocation. We find ourselves in a position where there has not been a reallocation of the spectrum for more than 20 years.

We find, in the field of land mobile radio usage, in the area where more and more businesses, hospitals, police, and other agencies need spectrum space, that in this area there is very little spectrum space allocated to them and that most of the spectrum is taken up by the Government and by broadcasters.

This is of concern not only to our sub-

committee but also to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] who serves on the Select Committee on Small Business, which is under the chairmanship of our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

I know they are looking into this. They have prodded the Federal Communications Commission to come forward with suggestions as to how they are going to reallocate usage of the spectrum.

Many of us in Congress feel they have been very slow in doing this. We have been after them for some years to come up with concrete suggestions as to how they are going to reallocate the spectrum. They have come forth with certain partial solutions, which, quite frankly, we do not believe to be adequate and do not believe will do the job—solutions such as channel splitting, and the squeezing together of usage on the channels. This does not really begin to solve the problem.

This problem is critical in our country. We are talking about an industry which needs space on the spectrum, which contributes well over \$20 billion to the gross national product of this Nation. We are talking about a problem which is not going to be resolved until the Federal Communications Commission comes up with suggestions for manners and methods in which they are going to reallocate portions of the spectrum.

I take this time only to stress this problem and to bring it to the attention of the House, because we intend to push the Federal Communications Commission on this.

We want action from the FCC. They have assured us and told us year after year that they are studying the problem and that they will have suggested remedies, but the fact is that time passes and all we keep hearing is they are still studying the problem. We think it is high time we get some word from them as to reallocations of the spectrum.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXPENSES, PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Presidential Transition Act of 1963 (3 U.S.C. 102, note), \$900,000, to remain available until June 30, 1970.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, with reference to presidential transition, what is this? Is this \$900,000 for an inaugural, or what is it?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I will say to my friend an act of Congress provides that every 4 years we must provide a certain sum of money to the General Services Administration, which is in charge of buildings, for the presidential transition, whether it is needed or not. I do not think it will be needed, and so it will revert to the Treasury. We only

put the money in because the law makes it mandatory for this in the fourth year to provide funds for presidential transition.

Mr. GROSS. So presidential transition means the installation of a President? Is that what it means?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I think the gentleman has the right interpretation, but I do not think there will be a change. Therefore, the money will not be expended and it will revert to the Treasury.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman hopes for the best and fears the worst.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I was going to say to my friend, I hope that he will not try to knock this out, because there will certainly be a transition next year, and we will have to have some money to pay for it.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. This has been done in the past, I will say to my friend. We only put the money in because it is mandatory under the law, and we state in the report that if not used it will be returned to the Treasury.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman saying that President Johnson did not mean what he said when he announced he was not going to be a candidate for the Presidency?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman will have to address himself to the President for that answer. He made his statement.

Mr. GROSS. But the gentleman says he does not expect the money to be spent. Evidently he means that the same President is going to be a candidate for reelection and will be reelected. Of course, I differ on the reelection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I will say to my friend that, if the Republicans do not find a good candidate, we may have to draft the President yet to be reelected. We only did this because the law makes it mandatory, and it directed that the Congress place this money in the fund. I do not think it will be used, and I say again it will revert to the Treasury and there will be some savings.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. There will be quite a substantial savings when the next Republican President comes up for the inaugural. I am sure it will be an austere affair and one that will be appreciated by the taxpayers by returning most of this money to the Treasury.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I recall a few years ago when Mr. Dewey was running and they had a large amount of money in the fund. Our friends on the other side were delighted with that amount.

They did not use the funds. Mr. Dewey did not get to use the funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861-1875) Title IX of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (42 U.S.C. 1876-1879), the National Sea Grant Colleges and Program Act of 1966 (80 Stat. 998), and the Act to estab-

lish a National Medal of Science (42 U.S.C. 1880-1881), including award of graduate fellowships; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; maintenance and operation of three aircraft and purchase of flight services for research support; hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed \$2,500 for official reception and representation expenses; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902); rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; \$400,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the foregoing amount not less than \$37,600,000 shall be available for tuition, grants, and allowances in connection with a program of supplementary training for secondary school science and mathematics teachers: *Provided further*, That receipts for scientific support services and materials furnished by the National Research Centers may be credited to this appropriation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DADDARIO

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DADDARIO: On page 22 strike out "that" in line 2, and all that follows down through the end of line 6.

(Mr. DADDARIO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, this was one of the objectives to which I referred during the course of my remarks during the general debate on this bill. To those who were not able to be on the floor at that time I shall very quickly reiterate what was said then so that the Members will understand what my intentions are.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], had referred in the report to the fact that the committee recognized the competence of the Director and members of the National Science Board and recommended that they make the necessary contractual adjustments in the institutional and fellowship grant programs to effectuate the economies proposed.

Mr. Chairman, that confidence which the committee has in the Director and the National Science Board is one which I applaud. I believe those gentlemen are men of the highest capability.

Mr. Chairman, my concern is that the subcommittee having recommended a cut in the National Science Foundation of \$100 million in a budget request of \$500 million or \$95 million less than in the present fiscal year would allow the National Science Foundation Director and the National Science Board to use their skill and to have the full discretion in deciding how much each of their programs ought to be cut. The \$37.6 million which is earmarked in the bill would simply mean that this program is given a favored place among all programs.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that this amendment would be supported so that in the cutting of programs in the National Science Foundation there will be a fair understanding of what needs to be done and that the moneys provided will be distributed equally with the hope that new programs will not be adversely affected.

Mr. Chairman, I urgently ask that this amendment be supported.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I regret to rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut. The gentleman is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development, but let me state that there is \$400 million in this bill for the National Science Foundation. The only restriction with respect to the \$400 million is that not less than \$37.6 million shall be available for grants and allowances in programs for training of secondary school science and mathematics teachers. This is to encourage a broad base for the teaching of science and mathematics. If we are going to have future scientists we need to have capable teachers at the secondary level. Out of the \$400 million we only ask that \$37.6 million be used at the secondary level. This provision has been included by our committee for some time.

Out of the funds provided the Foundation has complete authority and flexibility to place \$362.4 million wherever it wishes. Only a small amount is earmarked for the secondary schools of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, as I say, I regret having to oppose this amendment, but I feel it should be defeated.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I too regret having to oppose the amendment but I join the gentleman from Tennessee in his opposition to the amendment for the reasons stated by him.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have it understood that I support this program also. It is my feeling, however, that it ought not to be given a position of predominance over and above other programs.

I would say further that it should not be our responsibility here today to take one program and give it special emphasis. If we do that we will be forgetting that other important programs have come along over the years and that these should not be placed in a secondary role. Some of these programs have gone into every State in the Union, some help smaller colleges, and some support research in areas of extreme importance to our society. It logically follows that the way this legislation now reads would cause all these other programs to be more harshly treated because one program must be fully funded.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I too regret having to rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my distinguished and very close friend from Connecticut, Mr. DADDARIO. The gentleman does perform a very fine service as chairman of a

special subcommittee of the Science and Astronautics Committee. No one understands the programs, I believe, of the National Science Foundation, nor all the vast areas of science, more than he does. But I submit that regarding his particular amendment the recommendation of the committee in limiting these funds was proper. We have done so for the past—dozen years or so, I believe—and one of the reasons we have done so is because this committee, and the Members of Congress, have been impressed by this program. This program is a program in support of science and science education.

It provides \$21 million or there is a request for \$21 million for summer institutes.

For academic year institutes: \$9 million.

Inservice institutes: \$3 million.

On the college level summer institutes: \$3 million.

Academic: \$900,000.

Short course seminars: \$600,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] has expired.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the request of the National Science Foundation for this item was around \$40 million. We cut it back to \$37 million and we earmarked the funds that must be spent in this area. This committee over the years, and the Congress has followed this procedure.

I repeat again, we have carried this limitation annually in this bill. I do not think there is any question that if this particular prohibition is knocked out—if this limitation is eliminated—this is one area in which the National Science Foundation will make its largest cut.

Five hundred million dollars is requested by this Foundation in the fiscal year 1969. The committee recommended \$400 million.

Most of the money goes toward basic research—and for good reason. I think over the years this committee and the Congress, I am sure the gentleman from Connecticut will agree, have supported the National Science Foundation.

It is the judgment of the committee that there ought to be a prohibition against cutting these programs about which we speak.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. Is it not true that the National Science Foundation was slow, well a little slow, in getting into this field?

Mr. BOLAND. That is exactly right.

Mr. JONAS. And at the insistence of our subcommittee—we have been insisting that more emphasis be given to this aspect of the science problem and we do not want to see it turned back.

Mr. BOLAND. And would not the gentleman from North Carolina agree that in the years that we have been sitting in this committee and funding these programs it was the Subcommittee on Independent Offices that fully funded the request—not only fully funded but actually added more to the budget for this particular activity?

Mr. JONAS. Because this field has been neglected more than some of the others.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I am delighted to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, could the gentleman from Massachusetts indicate to me where the National Science Foundation has in any way shown that if my amendment would pass that this program will in fact be the one most deeply cut?

Mr. BOLAND. No.

Mr. DADDARIO. It is my understanding from making an investigation of this program that it is one which the National Science Foundation feels is important for it does, after all, support some 35,000 teachers. It should be understood, however, that, as the National Science Foundation has grown, other activities have developed within it which are of equal importance to science and science educators. All I am advising is that we recognize this and strike language which is limiting by its very nature.

Mr. BOLAND. May I say to the gentleman from Connecticut, I have no knowledge that this particular activity will be cut by the National Science Foundation.

But I have been around this Chamber long enough and on this committee long enough to know that some of the programs that are really close to the hearts of the Congress are the programs that are cut if you give flexibility to the departments down the street.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WYMAN

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WYMAN: On page 22, line 9; after the word "appropriation", strike out the period and insert in place thereof a colon, and insert thereafter the following: "and, *provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for or paid out to the benefit of any individual who at any time after the effective date of this Act, wilfully refuses to obey a lawful regulation of the university or college which he is attending or at which he is employed."

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is a very simple one.

In recent months we have witnessed much usurpation of the proper function of the academic administration in the country by student bodies. We pay hundreds of millions of tax dollars in scholarships to students and to graduate fellows. To the extent that any of them are wilfully involved in this type of action, the purpose of this amendment is to provide, if they are involved, after the effective date of this bill, that they then lose their scholarship.

The extension of criminal trespass, the resistance to arrest, the wilful disobedience, the invasion of the rights of property have extended even to the denial to universities of their physical facilities with which they operate the university, by physical occupation by students of ad-

ministration buildings, who have then refused to obey the lawful orders of the university to quit the premises.

The New York Times on May 5, 1968, reports that at Columbia they took papers out of the office of President Grayson Kirk, photographed them, and then peddled them around afterward. Not only is this theft, but any student engaged in this type of activity ought not to receive a Federal tax scholarship.

Students should know in advance—to the extent that any such are or may be involved—that if they do, after the effective date of this act, engage in such type of conduct, they will lose their scholarship or their fellowship or their graduate help, or whatever the aid may be.

No part of this amendment limits or otherwise restricts the grant of funds to the institution itself. It applies solely to individuals. This year, there are more than 14,000 fellowships. In the language of the justifications of the NSF in my Appropriations Subcommittee, more specifically the direct statement of the Director of the National Science Foundation, the Honorable Leland J. Haworth, on February 20, 1968:

Although exact numbers cannot be determined at this time, we estimate that the programs as proposed will advance the research and educational endeavors of more than 85,000 individuals. These funds will support the research of about 6,000 faculty members working in all the basic fields and will promote the advanced education of about 18,000 university and college students in science and engineering through fellowships, traineeships, and employment as research associates or assistants. An estimated 50,000 teachers of science, engineering and mathematics at the undergraduate, secondary and elementary school levels will participate in projects to improve their capabilities as educators and about 11,000 secondary and undergraduate students will participate in special research and educational projects.

Mr. Chairman, this simple amendment reflects the concern of Members of Congress to do something to help restore a greater measure of order and responsibility on the troubled campuses of America. One of the ways we can do this is to make it clear that engaging in this type of offensive activity cuts off your scholarship or fellowship help if you are receiving any. I sincerely urge the support of this amendment.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I would be opposed to a general prohibition against grants to colleges but I would like to inquire if the gentleman's amendment is directed to fellowships granted to individuals.

Mr. WYMAN. In response to the gentleman's question, it deals only with individuals. It does not apply to institutions. It would not in any way restrict the institution itself. It is intended as a help to the institutions in controlling their own internal affairs. It is intended as a warning to those who may be on a fellowship, paid for by the taxpayers of the United States, that if they engage in this kind of activity, they lose their fellowship or their scholarship as the case may be.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I will say to my friend that we will accept the amendment and consider it in conference if we can perfect it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Is this amendment intend to cover minor infractions of rules? For example, suppose the recipient of a scholarship violates a schedule of attending classes or lectures. Suppose he cuts a class, or for some important personal reason, does something that results in a minor breach of discipline. This example does not relate to the type of chaotic situation the gentleman has described, but I think we ought to know how far his amendment goes.

Mr. WYMAN. I appreciate the gentleman's concern. I would like to be candid with the gentleman. The intention, of course, is that the infraction shall relate to a disruption of the university or college administration. It is not so worded to require that, because, if it were so worded, the Parliamentarian has advised me, it would be subject to a point of order.

In my extension of my remarks I intended to offer such clarification. I was going to make that clear. There is no intention to penalize anyone by cutting off a scholarship for a minor infraction. The situation that this is directed to is the sort of thing that offends all of us: The usurpation of the administrative function and responsibilities of our educational institutions by willful disobedience and willful infraction of the law, sometimes extending to criminal conduct on the part of individual students who may be receiving a scholarship under this particular segment of this appropriation.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, we will take the matter to conference and will accept the amendment.

Mr. WYMAN. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH

For expenses necessary for carrying out programs of medical and prosthetic research and development, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, \$45,850,000.

BOMBING PAUSE IN VIETNAM IS STRENGTHENING THE ENEMY

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. RIVERS was allowed to speak out of order.)

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, on March 31, President Johnson announced the beginning of a bombing pause over portions of North Vietnam in an effort to encourage the North Vietnamese to meet us at the conference table. Since the date of that announcement, we have refrained from attacking military targets above the 19th parallel.

Now, let us look at the actions taken by the North Vietnamese in response to our indication of good faith.

The enemy has done the expected thing. They have taken full advantage of the situation to move men and supplies and to repair damaged installations and lines of communication.

What are some of the specific steps they have taken? The most significant step has been to start a feverish round-the-clock movement of land and water vehicles north of the 20th parallel. Prior to the March 31 announcement, our bombing had forced the North Vietnamese to disperse and camouflage their vehicles and to move them mostly at night. With the cessation of bombing, these vehicles are now moving freely around the clock, transporting military supplies and equipment southward. The April daily volume of truck traffic is considerably higher than the March volume, and daytime water traffic has increased nearly five times over March. Coastal draft used to support the North Vietnamese logistic effort have been sighted in numbers larger than seen at any other time in the past 3 years.

The bombing pause has also allowed the North Vietnamese to string out large quantities of supplies in open storage along highways, rail lines and waterways.

There has been increased activity in the port of Haiphong, especially in repairing the port's facilities and in dredging to clear the silt that has impeded the use of the shipping channel for the past year. Additionally, the bombing pause has allowed the North Vietnamese to accelerate repairs on their road, rail, and waterway network. Many bridges have been repaired or replaced, and new bypasses have been built. This has enabled the North Vietnamese to increase the speed and volume of supplies southward, and it has allowed them to bypass and restore damaged arteries. These repair efforts are currently underway throughout northern North Vietnam. April has seen a 2,000-ton increase in shipments of material to support NVA logistic operations.

Further, the North Vietnamese have used the pause to strengthen their surface-to-air missile defenses in the southern panhandle. One-third of the surface-to-air units now in this area entered after April 1, and additional units are expected to be shifted there if the bombing pause continues.

Are these activities indicative of a country interested in negotiating for peace?

And their activities have not even been confined to North Vietnam.

In South Vietnam, attacks on most major cities have been resumed at a cost of many lives, civilian as well as military.

Further, the enemy has begun heavy infiltration of South Vietnam. During the first 4 months of 1968, an estimated 80,000 to 100,000 North Vietnamese troops were seen moving south. About 75 percent of this movement occurred in March and April. The April infiltration total, the highest to date, exceeds the March record by some 7,000 men. This infiltration is especially significant for two reasons:

First, it will accelerate the present trend that is shifting the balance of enemy forces from VC to NVA. In 1965, only 4 percent of enemy troops in South Vietnam were NVA. Now, 75 percent of combat support groups and 33 percent of in-country strength is NVA. And this percent will increase as infiltration continues.

The infiltration is significant for a second reason because these infiltrating troops are intended as replacements for combat losses. At the present rate of infiltration, the enemy will be able to rebuild his units, thus enhancing his position for renewed attacks during the current offensive. This will be the first time in 18 months that the enemy has been able to sustain a personnel input adequate to cover its losses.

In addition to infiltration of troops, the North Vietnamese are sending in materiel arms and supplies, at a rate higher than the first 3 months of this year.

In conclusion, we can say that the enemy is taking full advantage of the bombing cessation:

To repair and construct roads and bridges;

To restore critical industries;

To increase surface-to-air missile defenses in the panhandle;

To employ additional military units southward; and, in general,

To increase their warmaking capabilities.

Most of all, we can say that the enemy is not deescalating, but rather is accelerating and strengthening its offensive and defensive capabilities. And we can say that the bombing pause has contributed significantly to the effectiveness of this effort, and the loss of the U.S. servicemen's lives.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

(On request of Mr. STRATTON, and by unanimous consent, Mr. RIVERS was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished friend and valued member of my committee, who is doing such a magnificent job, particularly on the antisubmarine warfare. I want to make this known now.

Mr. STRATTON. I appreciate my chairman's comments.

I wish to commend the gentleman from South Carolina for his remarks.

In view of the fact that more than 37 days have passed since President Johnson placed a limited halt on the bombing of North Vietnam, and in view of the fact that the evidence is, as the gentleman has just indicated, that they have not deescalated in return for our action but have, in fact, escalated their part of the conflict, would not the gentleman agree with me that there ought to be a decision in the near future that we resume the bombing so as to protect the lives of our men, if the enemy is, in fact, not going to deescalate?

Mr. RIVERS. I believe we should set some kind of a time limit whether we make it public or not.

We should not kid ourselves. These people are smart. They are trained. They

are resourceful. They have up-to-date arms. They have as good arms as we have. They have terrifically sophisticated surface-to-air missiles and antiaircraft power.

These people are wise. They are intent upon driving a hard bargain. And believe me when I say they are preparing for any outcome. They do not frighten easily. Death to them is as simple as the sun rising every morning.

The American public had better get this in mind. These people are not fools and we cannot handle this crowd with kid gloves.

Thank you very much for letting me speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

DEMONSTRATIONS AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL
RELATIONS

MODEL CITIES PROGRAMS

For financial assistance and administrative expenses in connection with planning and carrying out comprehensive city demonstration programs, as authorized by title I of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (80 Stat. 1255-1261), including \$100,000,000 for grants for urban renewal projects within approved city demonstration programs, to be transferred to and merged with the appropriation "Urban renewal programs" for the fiscal year 1969 in accordance with and subject to the provisions of section 113 of said Act, \$500,000,000: *Provided*, That the amount appropriated herein for other than urban renewal programs shall remain available until June 30, 1970.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FINO

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FINO: On page 33, line 4, strike out "\$500,000,000" and insert "\$312,000,000".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

(Mr. FINO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, the sole purpose of this amendment is to reduce the model cities appropriations from the \$500 million in this bill to \$312 million, which is the amount that was appropriated by this House or by this Congress last year.

The first thing I would like to point out is that any sum we vote in this House—and make no mistake about it—any sum we vote in this House will be increased in conference because the Senate, as usual, is bound to vote for more money. In order to keep these expenditures at a reasonable level, I urge the Members of this House to support this amendment, which will restore the amount to last year's appropriation.

Public opinion supports these cuts. Every congressional poll shows that the people oppose this program or want it cut. I have not seen one congressional district questionnaire which shows a majority of the people favoring an increase in this program.

The reasons are easy to set forth. This program, in my opinion—and I stated this time and time again last year and the year before—this program is a gimmick. It does not build housing. It does

not take people off welfare. It pursues much trickier goals. Some of you will remember 2 years ago I said on the floor of this House that this program would be used for school racial-balance schemes. Needless to say, my friends on the other side said I was wrong and that the model cities program had nothing to do with school busing to achieve integration.

I do not intend to discuss this at length. It is not necessary to do that. Just let me read you a list of the model cities education programs listed in the Education News of February 5, 1968. I have picked out the school racial-balance programs. In Oakland, Calif., an educational park; in Hartford, Conn., suburban-inner city school busing; East St. Louis, school busing; Baltimore, Md., school busing; Boston, Mass., suburban-inner city school busing; Newark, N.J., educational park; Buffalo, N.Y., educational park; Rochester, N.Y., school busing; Charlotte, N.C., educational park; Pittsburgh, Pa., racial balance in elementary schools.

I remember back in 1966 when the gentleman from New York, my friend who represents the quiet, peaceful campus of Columbia, said that this Congress should not apologize for supporting school busing and similar efforts. I am sure that this gentleman, the same gentleman, would be happy to take the same position today. I hope that the rest of this House is less anxious to vote Federal dollars for school busing. I know there will be some who will say that we must vote this money to appease the so-called Poor People's March; that we must vote this money or Dr. Abernathy's riot commandoes will burn down the rest of central Washington. This brings to mind an incident of 150 years ago when the pirates of Tripoli were forcing this Nation to pay tribute. Somebody coined a new slogan of "millions for defense but not one cent for tribute." The Navy cleaned out the pirates, and that was the end of the blackmail. I think the American people are waiting for an end to blackmail today.

If these programs are not blackmail, what are they? Certainly they do not work. Each year we have increased urban spending and each year we have more riots. As the programs have increased so have the riots. Nobody has pointed out the ineffectiveness of this spending better than the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. Time and time again he has shown how the increased expenditures in these programs have achieved nothing. Of course, I must admit that these programs have had one big effect.

All this spending has produced massive inflation and a massive Government financial mess. This we know. So I suggest that, in the name of sound economics and realistic sociology, we call this spending binge to a halt. Believe me when I say that the city voter is not for these programs—I have campaigned hard against them and won 2-to-1 reelection in the heart of New York City and I say to those of you who come from big cities you need to have no fear of that, because I am a good example of those conditions which you will face.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the amendment.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

(Mr. EVINS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I would call to the attention of the distinguished gentleman from New York that the HUD appropriation for fiscal year 1968 was \$312 million for the model cities program. For 1969 the President asked for \$1 billion for model cities. We were only able to consider funding to the extent of \$650 million in this bill. This is all that has been authorized. We have recommended \$500 million—a half-billion dollars—for the model cities program.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment, if adopted, would cut off at least half of the \$200 million provided for the initial model cities. It would also have the effect of reducing the amount to be provided for some 75 additional model cities to be announced soon. There are great needs to be met in our cities. In other words, if the gentleman's amendment is adopted it would take \$188 million out of the model cities program, and it would retard the effort to solve the complex problems of the cities.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, last year, during the consideration of this bill, I offered an amendment similar in nature, designed to wipe out all the model cities money except that for planning. The basis of my remarks at that time was the fact that not one cent of the planning money previously appropriated had been used. My amendment lost by only eight votes on tellers and a switch of 10 votes would have made the difference on my motion to recommit.

Mr. Chairman, I also made reference last year to my own home community of Peoria, Ill., by saying:

Mr. Chairman, I cannot help but be reminded that on this very day my hometown of Peoria, Ill., population 130,000, is formally receiving from the National Municipal League and Look magazine our second "All-America City Award." Peoria's award this year as one of the 11 cities so designated throughout the country is due to a combination of factors, not the least of which is the better than \$50 million downtown development program without one thin dime of Federal money. We have demonstrated and will continue to prove that we can be a model city on our own.

This \$50 million development program for Peoria is significant to this discussion today, for it is mere peanuts when you are talking about the really big metropolitan cities in this country. In other words, if you took the \$2.9 billion of original authorization for this program and divided it up equally among the initial 70 cities they have been talking about, you come up with less than what we are doing on our own in a community of merely 130,000 people.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, since last year we have embarked upon a program of urban renewal on our own without turning to the Federal Government for a dime. And how is it going to be accomplished? The city council passed a new 5-percent utility tax to fund the beginning of the program. Inasmuch as we are not designated as one of the cities to get any Federal money from this appropriation, I don't know why I should support it for others. Possibly if other cities around the country would do what we have done on our own we wouldn't have this crisis of the cities. The money comes from the same place—the people—and, I submit, we get a better dollars worth when we raise the money and spend it locally, rather than turning always to the Federal Establishment as some sort of bottomless pot at the end of the rainbow. I couldn't let the opportunity slip by without "tooting my horn" for my very progressive hometown of Peoria.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. (Mr. BOLAND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The gentleman from New York has been in opposition to these programs from the start. He is being consistent. If the gentleman's amendment is adopted we will, in effect, kill the model cities program.

The very core and the very heart of the model cities program is the supplementary grant program carried in this bill. With the \$500 million we have provided for the model cities, there is an amount of \$200 million provided for supplementary grants for the first group of model cities that were selected last year, some 74 cities. There is an additional \$200 million reserved for cities which will be selected within the next few weeks, and there is a \$100 million item for urban renewal in the model cities area.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the failure to provide sufficient money for supplementary grants will really damage this program because supplementary grants go to the core of this innovative program. It actually permits the local communities to start some programs on their own, funded by the Federal Government, but programs which are attuned to ongoing Federal programs. The ability of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to grant extra money to the cities so that they can take these grants and use it in specific programs they wish, such as education, garbage collection, transportation—almost any single item or any single activity which assists in giving a better life for the people in the ghettos—that is precisely what the model cities program is attuned to do.

So, Mr. Chairman, I submit that this drastic cut—and it is a drastic cut—this \$188 million cut—will come out of the supplementary grants program, and I submit that that is a dangerous procedure. I believe it would damage beyond repair the model cities program, and I would hope that this amendment would not be adopted.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. The subcommittee has already drastically cut this program; has it not? The cut was almost 25 percent.

Mr. BOLAND. The subcommittee has already cut this program by almost 25 percent; that is correct.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

We have considered this matter in this subcommittee very carefully. The mayors of the cities came before our committee and said "We need \$32 billion."

We asked them where we were going to get that amount of money, and they did not have the answer. But in any event they would and did strongly favor the second increment in the model cities program.

The \$100 million here is for urban renewal, being bricks and mortar, and on this I am sure everyone can be in agreement; \$200 million is for a reservation for the next group of model cities—about 70 cities that are going to be included by the Department, and that do have problems. The other \$200 million is for the second increment to the already designated first group of model cities.

I believe that this appropriation is warranted and needed in the atmosphere that prevails in this country today. It is not tribute, as the gentleman from New York has suggested. It is not appeasement. The cities are in a crisis, and we in this Congress should take steps to bring them out of it and help the residents in those cities that have problems.

These steps called the model city program may not be perfect, but these steps are a start in the right direction. In a very real sense this is a commitment to the challenge of our times, and it is a commitment that we should honor in this House at this time.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I agree with the remarks of the gentleman, and I wish to associate myself with his views.

I have voted on this side of the aisle, I think, for just about all of the Bow amendments—and in fact, I added them up the other day and I believe that last year I voted for \$14 billion in cuts in voting for the Bow amendments to appropriation bills, but this is one amendment to cut the model cities program that I cannot go along with. I will oppose it with all my heart.

I believe that our cities today face very serious problems, and if we in this Congress do not realize that, then surely something must be wrong with us. I believe that the committee has cut this appropriation enough at this particular time as far as I am concerned, and I will vote to oppose this particular amendment.

Mr. WYMAN. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

We do not know whether this program is going to work out the way it is claimed

it will work out, or whether all the claims that have been made for it will be proved to be correct in application, but it is a start in the right direction, and it should, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has said, be given a chance.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. I just want to take the time to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Michigan. He was sitting on the Committee on Banking and Currency when some of these programs were authorized. He has taken the floor in support of some of the great programs through which we hope to meet some of the problems that the cities are now confronted with.

As a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, he supported the rent supplement program, the model cities program, the urban renewal program, and many others. This is the kind of leadership that the other side of the aisle ought to follow.

The gentleman has been a very fine Member of the Congress in this area of urban matters.

May I say that that also applies to the gentleman from New Hampshire. I served with him on this particular subcommittee and I recognize his knowledge and ability and appreciate the time he has put in on the problems that affect our cities.

Mr. WYMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. In line with what our friend, the gentleman from New Hampshire, has said, I am sure that we all recognize the serious problems that confront the cities of our country.

I think one of the greatest challenges that confronts us is the challenge to municipal government with the problems involved in the population move, and the transition that has taken place in that respect, requiring great increases in services and new services as well. Then we must consider the limited field for taxation in the cities to meet these problems. This is the overall situation that we all must look at. It is certainly a basic problem and it applies to all the cities of our country, whether the chief executive who is elected is a Democrat or a Republican or an Independent, or nonpartisan.

These are the problems confronting the cities and certainly we should keep this amount in the bill. As a matter of fact, they need more. Certainly, we should keep the amount in that has been recommended by the committee.

Mr. WYMAN. I thank the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. I would just add, Mr. Chairman, that I think model cities is a vital program.

What is involved here is substantially less than the recommendation of the President's Riot Commission report. I hope that we will stand behind the action of the committee as a bare minimum, as an imperative commitment of faith to the cities, and vote down the amendment which would drastically curtail and weaken the program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MORTGAGE CREDIT

RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM

For rent supplement payments authorized by section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, \$12,000,000: *Provided*, That the limitation otherwise applicable to the maximum payments that may be required in any fiscal year by all contracts entered into under such section is increased by \$25,000,000: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation or contract authority shall be used for incurring any obligation in connection with any dwelling unit or project which is not either part of a workable program for community improvement meeting the requirements of section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1451(c)), or which is without local official approval for participation in this program.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FINO

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FINO: On page 34, line 25, strike out "\$25,000,000" and insert "\$10,000,000".

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] in support of his amendment.

(Mr. FINO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, the only purpose of this amendment is to reduce the rent subsidy appropriation from \$25 million to \$10 million, for the fiscal year 1969, and here again, to the same amount that we appropriated last year.

I want to make several quick points.

First of all, in my good judgment this program is very wasteful.

The average monthly subsidy per family under this program is \$75, almost twice the cost of public housing.

Private housing is used in this program so that economic integration can be achieved in places that public housing cannot go.

I do not believe this type of social objective is realistic or worth spending twice the cost of public housing.

Second, it has been a flop and has built practically no new housing.

The number of actual new units constructed under this program is negligible.

Five times as many persons have been helped under the rent certificate program which is cheaper and more effective, and that is the program that is in the statute books and which was sponsored by my colleague, the ranking member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Third, the spending that you authorize today, and this is very important and I hope the Members of the House will pay attention to it—the spending that you authorize today means 40-year contracts.

Every time you appropriate \$1 under this program you obligate yourself for 40 years, so that the \$25 million absorbed by this bill actually means \$1 billion.

Moreover, it is safe to say that if you vote the full \$25 million, as sure as God made little apples the House-Senate conference will raise that figure. To keep this wasteful program at a realistic level and a sensible level, I think it is necessary to cut the appropriation to the \$10 million that we appropriated last year. Last year when we appropriated \$10 million, we obligated ourselves to \$400 million.

Lastly, I would like to refer to public opinion of this program. Nowhere in the Nation does the majority of the electorate support this kind of program. Last year I put a group of congressional district polls in the RECORD. Support of the program ranged from 5 percent in suburban Indianapolis to 29 percent in Berkeley, Calif.

This program is, in my judgment, obnoxious to the American people and all but meaningless to the poor. As a matter of fact, it was originally designed by the administration to exclude the poor.

If we want to help the poor, we should increase appropriations for the rent certificate program.

I cannot possibly believe that this Congress would expand a program like this in a year when we want to make—and need to make—at least \$6 billion worth of budget cuts. The rent subsidy scheme is a good example of the type of misguided ways which should be cut back in view of our grave economic crisis.

I urge you Members of Congress to remember that very shortly you will be asked to vote for a 10-percent increase in taxes. I hope you have good explanations for your people back home when you vote for a program such as this.

I urge the Members of this House to support my amendment.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The gentleman from New York, I believe, suggested an alternative. He suggested that they might use the rent certificate program or some other program.

I would call the gentleman's attention to the report in which we said that in view of the evident need for substantial low-income housing, the Secretary is urged to utilize all the tools, the several approaches authorized by Congress, including the rent supplement program, the rent certificate program, which the gentleman has suggested, the public housing program, the leasing program, and others, to provide the low-rent housing that is needed throughout the Nation.

The testimony is to the effect that we need 60,000 low-rent housing units per year. In 10 years that is 600,000 units. We have had the public housing program for 30 years. The rent supplement program

is a private enterprise approach, allowing private homebuilders to contract and build these units. The rent supplement units remain on the local tax rolls. There is an incentive for the tenant to own the property. Rent supplement projects are privately owned, privately managed, privately financed. The rent supplement program is quite different from public housing projects, which are Government owned, Government managed, and Government controlled.

The amendment of the gentleman from New York would cut \$15 million out of the modest \$25 million we have included. The request is for \$65 million. The overall authorization is \$150 million. The authorization is for \$150 million, and the committee agreed on \$25 million. My friend would slash that amount still further.

This program is needed. It is being utilized. It has broad support. It is under local control. There is language in the bill which states that there will be no rent supplement program unless it is voted and approved by the local officials.

Who is eligible in the program? The needy, the elderly, the physically handicapped, those occupying low, substandard housing—those displaced by Government action or by a natural disaster. It applies only to those who meet the income requirements for public housing.

So, Mr. Chairman, we have gone up the hill and down the hill on this program. This issue has been debated before. It is an ongoing program, privately operated and privately maintained. The insurance companies have committed \$1 billion, so the Government can come forward with this commitment. I urge defeat of the amendment.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that rent supplements are basically a free enterprise program that it is beginning to be successful, and that the figures as well as the principles sustain this contention.

It is my understanding that at the present time there are some 41,000 rent supplemented units either completed, under construction, or in process. This has generated \$450 million in new mortgage funds. The \$25 million appropriation before us here would finance 27,000 units and approximately \$313 million in new mortgage money.

Further, the administrative processing time has been reduced, I am apprised, from some 18 months to 6 months.

I do not think rent supplements have been a "flop." Indeed, I think it is starting to hold out some of the first genuine hope that progress can be made in the ghettos under free enterprise, through the participation of limited dividend corporations and nonprofit organizations, such as church groups, pension funds, fraternal and teachers' associations.

To sum up, I believe this holds the promise of encouraging a vital, new, free-enterprise housing program. It clearly taps the resources of private enterprise. It keeps the property on the tax rolls. It encourages individual initiative, rather than forcing the tenant out of an apart-

ment when his income reaches a certain level. It fosters private ownership.

I think it is much more effective and much more humane than the stark, pedestrian public housing we have today. I think it meets the test of both fiscal responsibility and social imperative that is required by our national crisis in housing and in the cities.

The Riot Commission has recommended that we provide 6 million new housing units in the next 5 years, and the rent supplement program is at the heart of their recommendations. The Commission urges that it be revised in order to provide broader coverage and expanded in order to reach more needy families. Secretary Weaver has stressed the importance of rent supplements to the housing needs of this Nation. In a letter to me this morning, the Secretary said:

As you know, the President has set as a goal the construction of 6 million new housing units for low- and moderate-income families in the next 10 years. If we are to meet this objective, there must be a deep commitment on the part of government, Federal, State and local, as well as the wholehearted support of private industry. . . . I cannot overestimate the importance of the rent supplement program, and the importance of its adequate funding during fiscal 1969. Of all our programs it is the one that has the solid support of almost every facet of industry, including, of course, the private sector.

I hope the Congress and the Nation will meet their responsibilities and turn down this amendment.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, there will be many Members on both sides of the aisle who would like to debate this. The issue has been debated many times before and views are generally known, so I hope we can proceed to vote on the amendment.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. FINO: On page 34, line 25, strike out "\$25 million".

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this rent control program, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] says, is projected 40 years into the future. I guess it is 37 years, to be exact, because I believe this is the third fiscal year. It obligates the taxpayers to the spending of a billion dollars, and we have been hearing lately much talk about how the obligational authority should be reduced.

This is a program that never should have been started, and it seems to me there is no better time than now, here, today, to put an end to this business of rent supplements.

There is in this bill approximately \$72 million as a token payment—a token payment only—toward the retirement fund

of Federal employees. The Federal employees' retirement fund is more than \$51 billion in the red. The day is coming and coming soon when Congress will have to face up to that to the tune of \$1 or \$2 billion a year to make the Federal employees' retirement fund operative.

When are we going to start cutting down on these bills and prepare to meet the obligations that we have undertaken?

I witnessed the spectacle last Friday when President Johnson appeared on television. I saw the fist shaking and heard the charge that Congress was trying to blackmail him. In other words, some of us are blackmailers, because we insist on deep spending cuts to accompany a tax increase. He asserted that if Congress cuts more than \$4 billion off the spending program for fiscal year 1969, we will have indulged in a phony paper cut.

In other words, if we cut more than \$4 billion off the spending program of the Federal Government in fiscal year 1969 we are a bunch of "phonies."

This is an awfully good time, and I know of no better place to save \$25 million than right here and now on this direct subsidy of rents. I know of no better time to begin to pare this budget more than \$4 billion. I, for one, am willing to accept the challenge. I want to prove to the President, if it is possible to do it, that I am not a wooden soldier of the status quo. Perhaps some of the rest of you covet this role. Perhaps you like to be called "phonies." I do not.

I believe this is an excellent place to start. We should have adopted the other FINO amendment and cut \$188 million off the euphoniously labeled model cities program.

Model cities? Congress could spend \$50 billion and there still would be no model cities.

I agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO]. It is time the municipalities of this country measured up to their responsibilities and took care of their problems rather than passing them on to all the taxpayers.

I urge adoption of this amendment. I know of no better place to save \$25 million for the taxpayers of this country and accept the challenge of the occupant of the White House who appears on television to shake his fist and condemn Congress. Let us accept his challenge.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa and in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. The views of both gentlemen are well known and I would think that it would be futile to remind them that of all the virtues, the greatest is charity. Certainly, their harsh amendments reject this truth.

For over 30 years this Government has recognized and acknowledged the responsibility of the Federal Government to help the poor and underprivileged in our country in their housing needs. In 1936 the public housing program was initiated and over the years numbers of units have been added under its provisions. Although the program serves a useful purpose, in many instances it is found to be inadequate both in respect

to the numbers of units made available and in the type of housing provided. Certainly, the program was never sufficient to take care of the numbers of people who qualify for the housing it offers.

Thus, that program was augmented by the rent certificate program under which rent certificates were given to those who qualify in order to pay a portion of their rent. Unfortunately, in so many instances this program resulted in subsidizing substandard and slum buildings. But in view of the shortage of available dealings for those of low incomes there was no alternative. Although the program filled a gap, it did not stimulate construction of new housing.

It was for this purpose that the idea of using rent supplements was conceived. It differs from recent certificates because it fosters the construction of new housing for the underprivileged. It is a reasonable addition to the measures made available for housing the underprivileged. It provides housing that is not Government owned or operated. It invites limited dividend and not-for-profit groups such as church or labor organizations to undertake and build structures to house those who qualify. These are very limited classes.

The taxpayers pay a portion of the rent in all three classes of assistance. They subsidize a portion of the rental in public housing projects; they subsidize a portion of the rental through rent certificates and they do the same through the rent supplement program. The only difference is that recipients of the subsidy under the rent certificates program are not required to live in buildings identified as public housing projects.

The rent supplement program is a very useful tool to rebuild deteriorated and blighted areas. The need is desperate for the numbers of those who cannot find housing at prices they can afford to pay continues to grow. The rent supplement is a constructive instrument to meet their needs. I urge that both amendments be voted down.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. SCOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is my recollection that last year we had the same matter before the House and did originally eliminate the entire appropriation for rent subsidies. Then it went over to the other body and they put the money back in. The House backed down from its original position. Certainly, I hope that the House this time will strike out the entire appropriation for rent subsidy and will stick by its guns regardless of what is done in the other body.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, this is not the manner in which to meet the needs of the poor for housing. It discourages young people in this country from trying to obtain the ownership of their own homes. It takes away the incentive to attempt to acquire home ownership when a Government subsidy is provided for rental property. The

young people of the country often try to obtain home ownership, which tends to bind the family together. They make sacrifices to that end so that they can own a home of their own. Rent subsidy rewards the indolent and penalizes the ambitious. In my opinion it is a bad law and an excellent place to cut Government spending to help balance the budget.

I hope the amendment to the amendment will be adopted and this program will be eliminated.

Mr. FARBSTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose both amendments. I wonder how many sitting here realize that in the large cities the cost of renovating old buildings is so high that even to occupy renovated old buildings they, the impoverished, still need rent supplements. It is not only a question of their living in newly built homes or newly built houses. The cost of building is so high today that old, ramshackle structures that are being repaired must still be supplemented. Assistance must be rendered by government to the impoverished who seek to rent these apartments. I do not think that those of you who live in small communities and who live in small towns have any conception or realization of what rents are in the large cities, because if you had you would certainly never oppose rent supplements as has been offered here. If anything, you would go along with the sum originally requested of \$65 million. As far as I am concerned, I sincerely hope that the Senate increases this from \$25 million to \$65 million.

Mr. Chairman, certainly this is no place to seek to economize. If you can vote for \$410 million as a subsidy for farmers, if you can subsidize commercial farmers and factory farmers to the tune of \$410 million, then what is wrong in helping these poor people to have a half-way decent place—not a decent place but merely a half-way decent place—in which to live?

Mr. Chairman, we are trying to keep the cities cool this summer. The best way to heat them up is to pass these amendments. We are in trouble enough in the cities. You folks who come from small communities may not realize this. Appropriations are being cut down generally so that there is little money for jobs for those kids who walk the streets. Kids will be hanging around looking for trouble this summer unless something is done to increase the poverty appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, if we are going to continue to force poor people to live in broken down homes, with broken floors, with broken pipelines, we are going to have trouble in the cities. In other words, if we are going to continue to insist that the poor occupy homes that are shameful to live in there is bound to be a day of reckoning.

Mr. Chairman, I am certainly amazed that the gentleman from New York has offered an amendment to cut this appropriation down from \$25 million to \$10 million.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York enjoys the good fortune of

living at the edge of the city where there are many adequate homes available. But for the gentleman to disregard the occupants of the tenements, the ghettos, and the other unsuitable housing areas is unbelievable.

I beg of the members of the committee to defeat this amendment—both of these amendments.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BARRETT. It is my understanding that the 5 minutes is given, first, to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. STEPHENS].

The CHAIRMAN. That was not the way the Chair understood the request. The manner in which the unanimous-consent request was put to the Chair was that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

(Mr. BARRETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in the strongest possible opposition to the amendment. I was deeply sorry to see the Appropriations Committee cut the rent supplement authorization from the \$65 million requested by the President under existing law to only \$25 million. To cut the \$25 million even further would be, I would think, a completely irresponsible act in my judgment. The rent supplement program, for which we fought so hard, is a most promising supplement to our great public housing program. It offers a way for private enterprise and private mortgage capital to provide decent housing for the very poor who cannot pay an economic rent. At a time when our urban problems cry out for solution and at a time when decent housing is in critically short supply for low-income families, it is unthinkable that we would authorize a further cut in the rent supplement program. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject this shortsighted, ill-advised amendment overwhelmingly.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. EVINS of Tennessee yielded his time to Mr. STEPHENS.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. POLLOCK].

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee's recommendations with respect to the rent supplement program.

I do so for three reasons.

First, it seems to me that the rent supplement program complements the highly successful rent certificate program, sponsored by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL]. Both programs involve the private ownership of the rental units in question. Both programs retain the property on the local

tax rolls. Both programs involve a rental subsidy to families of low income.

The only difference is that the rent certificate utilizes existing housing whereas the rent supplement program involves either the substantial rehabilitation of existing housing or new construction.

Also it seems to me that the rent supplement program is quite comparable to the program sponsored by Mr. WIDNALL involving homeownership. In principle, it seems to me that both programs have much in common.

Second, I support the rent supplement program because it is endorsed by a very responsible number of professionals in the field of housing. For example, the rent supplement program is supported by the National Association of Home Builders, the National Association of Real Estate Boards, the Mortgage Bankers Association, the President's Committee on Urban Housing, and Urban America. I could also add a very substantial number of other groups to this list. All of these groups are oriented toward private enterprise.

Third, I support the rent supplement program because it offers a viable alternative to the conventional public housing program and at this point and time it seems to me that the rent supplement program is certainly no more costly than the public housing and in fact it may be somewhat cheaper, certainly on the short-term basis it is cheaper. Finally the rent supplement program is on the books; it is operative and perhaps it is time that we concentrate our efforts on doing something to relieve the pressures in the cities for decent, safe, and sanitary housing.

(Mr. POLLOCK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I oppose both the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] and the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO]. Both are designed to gut the rent supplement program. I can understand, although I thoroughly disagree with, the attitude of the gentleman from Iowa. He has probably never been exposed to the squalor and degradation of the slums. But I am baffled by the attitude of the gentleman from New York who must know the depth of the housing crisis in New York City.

According to the 1960 census, there were then 550,000 units of dilapidated and substandard housing in New York City. There are 135,000 families on the waiting list for public housing in New York City. And New York City's government has been able to build only an annual average of 2,500 units of low cost public housing in the past 2 years despite the fact that the Department of Housing and Urban Development had the funds to approve 7,500 units per year.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] said the rent supplement program was a "flop." The real failure is the failure of the New York City adminis-

tration to use available Federal funds for a variety of housing programs.

Under the Fino amendment \$10 million would yield about 11,000 units for the entire Nation. Because of the 15 percent limitation for any single State, this would mean about 1,200 units for New York City—which would barely make a dent in the problem.

I also deplore the not so subtle appeal to the prejudices of those who continue to resist open housing in the suggestion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] that the purpose of the rent supplement program is to promote integrated housing. Assuming *arguendo* that it is, open housing is a proper objective. The program should be used to open the suburbs and to bring about integrated communities. Otherwise, the crisis of the cities will not be resolved.

Rather than debating amendments to gut the rent supplement program, we should be increasing the appropriation, which provides for only \$25 million. Neither that amount nor the administration's request of \$65 million is sufficient. The total 4-year authorization through fiscal year 1969 is \$150 million, and only \$42 million has been appropriated. Instead of \$25 million, it would take \$108 million to keep faith with the commitment made when the rent supplement program was originally authorized.

The authorization of \$150 million would have produced some 175,000 units. However, Congress has obstructed the program by low funding to the point where only 2,734 units are occupied, 16,108 units are under construction, and 23,500 units are in planning for an overall total of 42,342 units. If we continue at this pace, one-fifth of our Nation will remain ill housed for years to come. And the frustration and despair of the slums will intensify. An affluent society has an obligation to all of its citizens which must not be ignored.

The amendment to the amendment, and the amendment, should be defeated.

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(By unanimous consent, Mr. RYAN yielded the remainder of his time to Mr. STEPHENS.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

(Mr. FINO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I listened to my colleague from New York, and I cannot quite understand all of his excitement. I want to make my position crystal clear.

I am not opposed to housing, but I am opposed to what we call expensive housing, and that is exactly what this rent supplement program is all about—expensive housing. We can provide plenty of sufficient housing for our so-called poor people if we concentrate on the programs that we have on the statute books.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT].

(Mr. GILBERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, may I say I heard my distinguished colleague from my county, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO], just make some reference to this amendment. May I say that, living in the Bronx and living in the city of New York, I know the importance of the rent supplement program.

I truly join my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBERSTEIN], in saying that I am truly dismayed and shocked that Mr. FINO does not quite understand the nature of the problem that we have in our city. I believe that we here can make this little gesture for the people who live in these ghetto areas, and in the district that I represent. I know the people want this and need it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY].

(Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I used to serve on the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and when this program first came up I opposed it. I did so because I thought the regulations were poorly drawn and because the money was not going to the needy people who truly needed it, but these regulations have now been changed. If the Members do not believe so, then they should look at the regulations such as those I have here in my hand and study them. Do not just arbitrarily reject this program.

This is a program that is designed to help the poor, for that reason I have supported the program since the regulations were revised and I support the program today. I ask my colleagues on this side of the aisle to scrutinize it carefully. There are only two ways of helping the poor with housing. We can give them public housing or supplement their rents in rental housing. Mr. Chairman, this program deserves a chance to prove its worth. I hope both amendments will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. STEPHENS] to close the debate.

(Mr. STEPHENS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEPHENS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Georgia has yielded to me so that I may add my strong support to the rent supplement program. This program has already more than proven its value in West Virginia through the projects which have just recently been authorized, and for which groundbreakings have already been held. I might also mention that when we had a test vote on this issue last fall, I voted for \$40 million in funds for rent supplements, even though we lost that vote in 1967.

I would like to speak briefly regarding the importance of the appropriations for the rent supplement program in the bill

before us. This program is an integral part of the effort to provide decent housing for lower income families, for the elderly, the handicapped and for those who now occupy substandard housing.

Under this program, housing owners, who must be private nonprofit, limited-distribution, or cooperative mortgagors, enter into contracts with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to receive Federal rent supplement payments. They are thus able to provide privately built, owned, and financed housing to worthy tenants who might not otherwise be able to afford the rent. Complementing the low-rent public housing program, rent supplements help to increase the available supply of shelter for those most in need.

Since its inception, this program has been underfunded, with only \$10 million in contract authorization provided for this fiscal year. I would urge that the committee recommendation for an appropriation of \$25 million be granted in full. This would be an important step toward providing decent shelter for the many Americans who cannot now afford it. In broader perspective, it would be an impressive step toward meeting the President's commendable goal of ridding the Nation of its substandard housing in the next 10 years.

There is a great need for decent housing in this country. There are nearly 6 million occupied substandard homes sheltering nearly 20 million people in this country at the present time—a time of unequalled prosperity for the majority of Americans. One way of helping to meet the housing needs of this country is through the rent supplements program and I would hope that every Member of this body would vote to provide the funds which that program requires for effective implementation.

The rent supplement program depends in large measure on the private sector, which is building the needed housing in our towns, villages, and cities. Full funding of the program will maximize the number of families of low income who will be afforded an opportunity to live in decent shelter for the first time.

Tenants assisted through the rent supplement program will pay 25 percent of their income and Federal financial assistance, which will be paid to the owners of the housing, will make up the difference between the tenants' payments and the full market rent.

This program, which has gotten off to a good start—even though the funding was not what it should have been, is an important tool in our efforts to help the American city. As President Johnson has described it, the rent supplement program is "the most crucial new instrument in our effort to improve the American city." I certainly hope that the pending amendments designed to get the program are soundly defeated.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to both amendments. We enacted the rent supplement program in 1965 but made no funds available to get it underway until mid-1966. Throughout its short history, it has been continually underfunded. I want to bring up to date the status of this program.

The rent supplement program is popular. It has the support of business, labor, and welfare groups. Limited dividend corporations and nonprofit groups have flocked to file applications to help in providing decent homes for low-income Americans. The funds available have never matched the number of worthy applications. At the present time, there are 132 applications, representing 12,260 units of supplemented housing, awaiting new funds for the program.

Progress under the rent supplement program has been noticeable. By the end of fiscal year 1969, there will be 384 rent supplemental projects, located throughout the country, and providing nearly 27,000 units of supplemented housing.

In his budget for this year President Johnson asked for \$65 million in funds for this program. That amount would have provided about 72,000 units of supplemented housing. The Appropriations Committee has recommended \$25 million for the program in the next fiscal year. This is a \$40 million reduction. This will provide about 28,000 units of supplemented housing.

The program has many advantages. To repeat some of my prior arguments: The housing provided under it is privately owned, built, and managed. It remains on the tax rolls, helping a city and county to meet its financial needs. The principle in this is the same as rent certificates; same, in fact, as flood insurance.

No program does more to use Federal funds efficiently, for as a tenant's income rises, the amount of supplement paid is reduced. In addition, the tenant is not penalized if his income rises. He does not have to move from his home, but simply pays more of the actual rent.

The rent supplement program has gained the support of homebuilders, realtors, and the mortgage banking industry. All of these groups realize the advantages of involving private industry in the attempt to provide decent low-cost housing.

I believe the rent supplement program is demonstrating its worth. Let us recognize its value by accepting the committee's full recommendation of \$25 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fino].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gross), there were—ayes 48, noes 85.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fino].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Fino), there were—ayes 51, noes 92.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read in full and that the bill be open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROYHILL OF VIRGINIA

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia: On page 46, immediately after line 3, insert the following:

"Sec. 308. No part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to pay the salary of any Federal employee who is convicted in any Federal, State, or local court of competent jurisdiction, of inciting, promoting, or carrying on a riot, or any group activity resulting in material damage to property or injury to persons, found to be in violation of Federal, State, or local laws designed to protect persons or property in the community concerned."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized in support of the amendment.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, three times before I have proposed to this House that we take action to deny payment of salaries to any Federal employee who is convicted of inciting, promoting, or carrying on a riot, or of any group activity resulting in material damage to property or injury to persons. Three times the Members of this House have agreed with me that Federal money should be denied those who participate in such activities.

As I said last week during debate on the Agriculture appropriations bill, this restriction contained in appropriations measures for other agencies has enabled the employing agencies to warn their employees against participation in illegal acts. I sincerely regret that the restriction was not in effect in all of our Federal agencies during the recent Washington riots.

The amendment I offer today, like the previous three, provides that no funds appropriated under this act shall be used to pay salaries of any Federal employee who is convicted in any Federal, State, or local court of competent jurisdiction, of inciting, promoting, or carrying on a riot, or any group activity resulting in material damage to property or injury to persons, found to be in violation of Federal, State, or local laws designed to protect persons or property in the community concerned.

Unlike two previous amendments, the amendment I offer today does not extend to recipients of services or grants from any of the agencies funded under this act, so that there can be no question here of the denial of charitable services to innocent family members of recipients.

It does, however, prevent those agencies funded under this act from being forced, through lack of restrictive legislation, to continue to finance any of its employees who are intent on destroying law and order by providing them with funds from the very Government they are bent on destroying.

Again I say as I did last week during debate on the agriculture appropriations bill, there are more than enough

good citizens, black and white, seeking employment with this Government. We do not have to pay salaries to those whose chief pastime is to kick America around, while basking in the bonfires they set in our cities.

I did not know of any Agriculture employees involved in the looting when I offered this amendment last week. I have since learned there were two. I do not know of any employees affected by this amendment today. However, I again say that I sincerely believe every loyal Federal employee will agree with me that neither they nor any of their loyal fellow employees want those seeking to destroy their Government working side by side with them and being paid by that Government.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has discussed the amendment with me. It has been adopted before. Without objection, we will accept the amendment and take it to conference. We hope if we have some violators that we can get some convictions and some action.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Broyhill].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I shall be brief. I shall offer a motion to recommit which embodies the same amendment that was accepted by the chairman of the Treasury-Post Office Appropriation Subcommittee last April 9. And, it is the same amendment that was adopted by the Committee of the Whole last Wednesday when we debated the agriculture appropriation bill.

Simply stated, the amendment would set a ceiling on the expenditure of Federal funds in fiscal 1969 by the agencies provided for in the bill in the total amount of \$15,518,483,000, or \$732,808,000 less than the \$16,251,291,000 which these agencies proposed in the January budget to spend next year. I want to point out that this represents a cut of only 4.5 percent in their planned spending and certainly is proper in light of the fact that we may soon be voting on an overall package to reduce expenditures and obligational authority and to increase taxes on almost everyone. Last week this House approved a cut in Agriculture Department spending of 6 percent.

I want to reiterate what has been said earlier in the debate today. The Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee has reduced the obligational authority requests in this bill by almost \$2.9 billion, including the elimination of \$2.1 billion of participation sales authorizations which do not, however, affect current plans for program activities proposed by the agencies. The subcommittee has estimated that its actions in reducing the obligational authority requests by the \$2.9 billion will result in actual cutbacks totaling \$360 million in 1969 proposed spending by these agencies. I commend

the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] and other members of the subcommittee for accomplishing these reductions, some of which will have a real impact on the spending programs of these agencies in 1969. I do want to point out, however, that their actions would result in a cutback of only 2.2 percent in the spending plans of these agencies next year. And, I think we are all agreed that greater cutbacks must be made if we are to accomplish the goal that the Appropriations Committee set for itself last week when it endorsed a resolution proposing a cutback of \$4 billion in planned 1969 spending. Of course, that resolution made certain exceptions for special Vietnam costs, interest on the public debt, payments from trust funds and other relatively uncontrollable expenditures.

Thus, the agencies provided for in this bill, as well as others which are not in the relatively uncontrollable category, will have to share to a greater extent in the cutbacks than they would if the overall cutback were applied on a straight, across-the-board basis.

The amendment in the motion to recommit takes the approach that spending in fiscal 1969 should be held at the 1968 or 1969 level, whichever is lower, plus certain mandatory increases over which the agencies have no control. These mandatory increases include such items as the annualization of salaries, postage rate increases, the Pay Act increase of last October, and increases resulting from contractual obligations previously made. The lower of 1968 or 1969 expenditures by these agencies totals \$14,686,205,000 to which we have added \$832,278,000 of mandatory increases, making a total expenditure ceiling of \$15,518,483,000 which I mentioned earlier.

These mandatory increases include \$285,975,000 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, \$362,500,000 for the Veterans' Administration and \$183,803,000 for the other agencies provided for in the bill. The details of these mandatory increases were supplied to the Independent Offices Subcommittee by the agencies involved and, as submitted, they totaled \$1,186 million. Analysis of these increases revealed, however, that the Department of Housing and Urban Development had included in their mandatory increases a number of items that were purely administrative determinations and reservations and were not mandatory in any sense of the word. But, I do want to make absolutely clear to everyone that their estimates of mandatory increases for the model cities program, the rent supplement program, the low rent public housing program, and housing for the elderly and handicapped were accepted by us at face value and have been included in the mandatory increases allowed by the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good amendment and worthy of an affirmative vote by the House. Although it would reduce spending in 1969 by \$732 million, or \$372 million more than the Appropriations Committee was able to cut, it will not curtail any of the essential services per-

formed by these agencies. Moreover, it will help us reach the expenditure reduction goal which was approved by the Appropriations Committee last week and I urge its adoption.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have been trying to overcome the general lack of appreciation of the Renegotiation Board in 2 years of speeches in behalf of strengthening the Board. Despite its general obscurity, the Board is the foremost restraint against profiteering on defense and space contracts. It is the only independent agency whose entire efforts are dedicated to determining and recovering excessive profits on Government contracts.

Since its inception in 1953, the Board has saved the American taxpayer \$2 billion, either by directing contractors to return excessive profits to the Treasury, or by its activities which lead contractors to voluntarily make price reductions or refunds to the Government agencies. In addition, the very presence of the Board acts as a deterrent to profiteering, just as the policeman on the beat cuts down on temptation.

In comparison with the \$2 billion recovered by the Board in excessive profits, the Board's expenses have totaled \$50 million since its inception. Discounting tax adjustments and credits, I estimate a savings-cost ratio of 18 to 1. This means that the Board saves for the American taxpayer \$18 for every \$1 spent to maintain it. In the case of the appropriations for the Renegotiation Board, then, we are talking of spending in order to get the means to recover much more in excessive profits.

I would have liked an increase of \$600,000 in fiscal 1969 over the Board's appropriation for last year. This would provide the Renegotiation Board with 44 or 45 additional positions to enable it to cope with the increased workload generated by the Vietnam conflict. Because the Board reviews the completed contracts of the larger prime and subcontractors on a fiscal year basis, its review runs 2 or 3 years behind the awarding of the contracts. Therefore, the Board is only now feeling the effects of the Vietnam procurement buildup.

The administration figure was an austerity request for an agency already pared down to the bone. It was based on a conservatively estimated increase in workload generated by Vietnam.

In my statements in behalf of a strong Renegotiation Board, I have cited example after example, trend after trend, indicating that excessive profitmaking is considerably more rampant than the Defense Department officials ever acknowledge. I think it very likely that the man-hours the Board will need to ferret out this increased profiteering was estimated too low. But in any event, with a likely budget deficit of \$20 billion, how can we be justified in withholding full funds from an agency which adds—not subtracts—to the Treasury, in proportion to the funds spent to operate it?

In fiscal 1967, prime military contract awards for Vietnam exceeded the high mark of \$43.6 billion reached during

the Korean conflict, and they are continuing at about the \$45 billion level this year. Yet at the height of the Korean period, the Renegotiation Board had 742 employees and a budget of \$5,093,000, as compared to a present budget of \$2,600,000 and 174 employees.

Actually, one of the reasons for the relative weakness of the Board today has been a series of amendments greatly limiting the Board's jurisdiction. However, I have a bill presently under consideration by the Ways and Means Committee which would restore the Board to its Korean capabilities.

But the simple truth is that the Renegotiation Board's fight against war profiteering was fully supported during the Korean war, in terms of basic statute, in terms of manpower and in terms of budget. The Board responded in kind, with determinations of excessive profits exceeding \$150,000,000 for 3 of those years.

Today there are many examples of war profiteering. Today there are ample indications of increased profitmaking on defense contracts. But the simple truth is that this Congress and this Nation is largely unconcerned about the inequality of sacrifice relative to Vietnam. Few seem to care that American soldiers are dying in Vietnam in a very hot war, while a few unscrupulous or negligent profiteers are allowed to make a killing on defense contracts in stateside comfort.

The Renegotiation Board needs a significant increase in personnel to give the taxpayer a fair chance at recovering exorbitant profits made on Vietnam procurement. There is every reason to believe that the Board would continue to save \$18 for every \$1 expended. Thank you.

(Mr. GONZALEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I commend the gentleman for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. I read an item in the New York Times a few days ago to the effect that appearing before the House Committee on Banking and Currency Admiral Rickover made the assertion that on many defense contracts profits of as much as 25 percent were being made by defense contractors. This should not be tolerated. Certainly there is a job for the Renegotiation Board to do here, and I hope it accepts its responsibility fully.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. I want to join the gentleman from Illinois in commending the gentleman from Texas on his presentation here. There is no question about the fact that the Renegotiation Board has done a good job with the budget and authority it has had.

As the gentleman knows, we have provided some \$400,000 more for fiscal year 1969 than for 1968.

I know that the gentleman does have a bill, H.R. 6792, which would strengthen the Renegotiation Board. I hope that the Ways and Means Committee will act on this measure very soon and bring it to the floor of the House for passage.

I believe the points that the gentleman makes need attention.

Mr. Chairman, since the Renegotiation Board's inception, the determinations of excessive profits have totaled \$952,436,037 before adjustment for Federal taxes. Voluntary refunds and voluntary price reductions have totaled \$1,300,121,259.

Because of the normal timelag between the award of a contract and the reporting of receipts and accruals thereunder for renegotiation, as well as the time required for the processing of a renegotiation case, the effect of accelerated Vietnam procurement is not reflected in the determinations I have just mentioned.

The Renegotiation Board has authority under the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended, to determine and eliminate excessive profits realized by contractors and subcontractors in the defense and space programs. So, the Renegotiation Board is charged by law to look into these contracts.

Renegotiation is conducted not with respect to individual contracts, but with respect to the receipts or accruals of a contractor under all renegotiable contracts and subcontracts in a fiscal year of the contractor.

In 1967, the Renegotiation Board made 18 determinations of excessive profits totaling \$15,980,214. Also, in the same period, contractors reported voluntary refunds and voluntary price reductions in the amount of \$30,318,586.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts. It is very heartening to hear the remarks made by the gentleman from Massachusetts and by the gentleman from Illinois—and, above all, those of the chairman of the subcommittee who supported this general movement in his remarks made in the hearings on the appropriation bill.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio announced he is going to offer a motion to recommit. I will offer an amendment to the motion.

I would say to my friend that I share his desire for economy and cutting expenditures. I think we have done this to a very substantial degree in this bill. You will be given an opportunity in voting for this bill to vote for cuts of \$2,899,944,000 or almost \$3 billion in new obligational authority and \$360 million in expenditures this year.

My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, would propose reducing expenditures by \$372 million more. This would bring about an additional spending cut of half a billion dollars out of only a portion of the bill.

Gentlemen, we think this goes too far. We are all familiar with the Bow amendment. I share the view of the gentleman from Ohio with regard to economy, but I think this is going absolutely too deep. We have already cut this bill 17.5 per-

cent. This is \$2.9 billion below the budget request. To limit expenditures as the gentleman from Ohio suggests means that the Government may have to defer payments to contractors. He says that payments to veterans may not be affected, but I am not sure of this. This amendment might cause some delay in payment of hospital benefits. Also the payments for local air carriers might be impaired. I would say that his amendment increases the redtape. It increases the cost to the Government and others concerned across the board.

The Bow amendment merely says that the Government must not pay its bills when they are due. Frankly, I was hopeful that I could accept the amendment offered by my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, and I hoped he would make it along the lines that we recommended, in a reasonable amount. However, I feel that the amount he recommends goes too far and too deep. We have made substantial cuts in appropriations. We estimate that the expenditures in this bill bring about reductions of \$1.1 billion less than 1968 after adjusting for certain mandatory pay act increases. The expenditure reductions made by the committee will be \$360 million from the budget. The gentleman from Ohio wants to more than double the expenditure reductions. This, my friends, is unwise and unsound.

I point out further that if this amendment were adopted some 20,000 to 25,000 Government contractors throughout the Nation might have to wait for the payment of bills after they perform their work. The gentleman's amendment does not limit the obligations. The gentleman's amendment merely says that bills cannot be paid when due. Mr. Chairman, we do not want it said that contractors, after they have performed their work, cannot receive their payments on time.

I believe this amendment is unsound, I believe it goes too far, and I believe you should vote down the Bow expenditure ceiling and vote for the large and substantial reductions which have already been made in this bill. You will be given an opportunity to vote for about a \$3 billion cut in this bill. I hope that the recommittal motion will not be adopted.

[Mr. RANDALL addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'HARA of Michigan, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 17023), making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban De-

velopment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed, and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BOW. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bow moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to that committee to report it back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 46 after line 3, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 308. Money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in the net aggregate expenditure of Federal funds by all agencies provided for herein (including the Office of Civil Defense) beyond \$15,518,483,000, except by those Veterans' Administration and Federal Home Loan Bank Board expenditures required by law which may exceed budget estimates therefor and except by those reimbursements made by departments and agencies to the General Services Administration for services rendered."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the motion to recommit.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BOW. The motion to recommit being the prerogative of the minority, and the minority having exercised that prerogative, my parliamentary inquiry is as a matter of fact whether or not an amendment is in order, and if it is in order, whether the gentleman making it must indicate that he too is against the bill in its present form?

The SPEAKER. In response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Ohio, the Chair will state to the gentleman that the motion to recommit is one with instructions. Since the previous question has not been ordered, it is open for amendment.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on my motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the Chair had already recognized the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BOW. Again, Mr. Speaker, I request the Chair to rule on whether or not if the gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment to the motion to recommit which has been offered by the gentleman from Ohio, whether he would then have to state if he is opposed to the bill in its present form.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. Speaker, I ask that my amendment be reported and I would say to my friend that under my amendment I attempt to bring it up to \$360 million and this is the foundation for my support.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state in response to the second inquiry of the gentleman from Ohio that the gentleman from Tennessee would also have to qualify.

Does the gentleman from Tennessee press his amendment?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I again move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. Speaker, my amendment would provide for \$360 million.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Tennessee would also have to qualify that he is opposed to the bill, or opposed to the bill in its present form.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on my motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee still press his amendment?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. Speaker, I ask the withdrawal of my amendment.

The SPEAKER. The amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee had not been reported by the Clerk and he withdraws his amendment.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 173, nays 216, answered "present" 2, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 122]

YEAS—173

Abbott	Broyhill, Va.	Denney
Abernethy	Buchanan	Derwinski
Andrews,	Burke, Fla.	Devine
N. Dak.	Burton, Utah	Dickinson
Arends	Bush	Dole
Ashbrook	Byrnes, Wis.	Downing
Bates	Cahill	Duncan
Battin	Cederberg	Erlenborn
Belcher	Chamberlain	Eshleman
Bennett	Clancy	Findley
Berry	Clausen,	Fino
Betts	Don H.	Flynt
Blester	Clawson, Del.	Ford, Gerald R.
Blackburn	Cleveland	Fountain
Bolton	Collier	Gardner
Bow	Colmer	Gathings
Bray	Conable	Goodell
Brinkley	Cowger	Goodling
Brock	Cramer	Griffin
Brotzman	Curtis	Gross
Brown, Mich.	Davis, Ga.	Grover
Brown, Ohio	Davis, Wis.	Gubser
Broyhill, N.C.	Dellenback	Gurney

Haley	May
Hall	Mayne
Hammer-	Meskill
schmidt	Michel
Harsha	Miller, Ohio
Heckler, Mass.	Mills
Henderson	Mize
Hosmer	Montgomery
Hull	Morton
Hunt	Myers
Hutchinson	Nelsen
Ichord	O'Neal, Ga.
Jarman	Ottenger
Johnson, Pa.	Pelly
Jonas	Pettis
Jones, N.C.	Poff
Keith	Pollock
King, N.Y.	Price, Tex.
Kleppe	Quie
Kuykendall	Quillen
Kyl	Randall
Laird	Rarick
Langen	Reid, Ill.
Latta	Reifel
Lennon	Reinecke
Lipscomb	Robison
Lloyd	Rogers, Fla.
Lukens	Roth
McClory	Roudebush
McCloskey	Rumsfeld
McClure	Sandman
McEwen	Satterfield
Mailliard	Saylor
Marsh	Schadeberg
Martin	Scherle
Mathias, Calif.	Schneebell

NAYS—216

Adams	Fraser
Addabbo	Friedel
Albert	Fulton, Pa.
Anderson,	Fulton, Tenn.
Tenn.	Fuqua
Annunzio	Galifianakis
Ashley	Gallagher
Aspinall	Gialmo
Ayres	Gilbert
Baring	Gonzalez
Barrett	Gray
Bell	Green, Pa.
Bingham	Griffiths
Blanton	Gude
Blatnik	Halpern
Boggs	Hamilton
Boland	Hanley
Bolling	Hansen, Wash.
Brademas	Harvey
Brasco	Hathaway
Brooks	Hawkins
Broomfield	Hébert
Brown, Calif.	Hechler, W. Va.
Burke, Mass.	Helstoski
Burleson	Hicks
Burton, Calif.	Holifield
Button	Horton
Byrne, Pa.	Howard
Cabell	Hungate
Carey	Irwin
Casey	Jacobs
Celler	Joelson
Clark	Johnson, Calif.
Cohelan	Jones, Ala.
Conte	Jones, Mo.
Conyers	Karth
Corbett	Kastenmeier
Culver	Kazen
Daddario	Kee
Daniels	Kelly
Dawson	King, Calif.
de la Garza	Kluczynski
Delaney	Kornegay
Dent	Kupferman
Diggs	Kyros
Dingell	Leggett
Donohue	Long, La.
Dow	Long, Md.
Dulski	McCarthy
Dwyer	McCulloch
Eckhardt	McDade
Edmondson	McDonald,
Edwards, Calif.	Mich.
Edwards, La.	McFall
Esch	McMillan
Evans, Colo.	Macdonald,
Everett	Mass.
Evins, Tenn.	Machen
Fallon	Madden
Farbstein	Mahon
Fascell	Matsunaga
Feighan	Meeds
Fisher	Minish
Flood	Mink
Foley	Minshall
Ford,	Monagan
William D.	Moorhead

Schwengel
Scott
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stuckey
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Utt
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Whalley
Whitener
Whitten
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wyder
Wyllie
Wyman
Zion
Zwach

Tunney	Waldie
Udall	Walker
Ullman	Whalen
Van Deerlin	White
Vander Jagt	Willis
Vanik	Wilson,
Vigorito	Charles H.
Waggonner	Wolff

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Anderson, Ill. Dorn

NOT VOTING—42

Adair	Green, Ore.	Mathias, Md.
Andrews, Ala.	Hagan	Miller, Calif.
Ashmore	Halleck	Moore
Bevill	Hanna	Morse, Mass.
Carter	Hansen, Idaho	Nichols
Corman	Hardy	O'Hara, Ill.
Cunningham	Harrison	Olsen
Dowdy	Hays	Pucinski
Edwards, Ala.	Herlong	Purcell
Eilberg	Holland	Rhodes, Ariz.
Frelinghuysen	Karsten	Selden
Garmatz	Kirwan	Watts
Gettys	Landrum	Widnall
Gibbons	MacGregor	Wyatt

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Dorn for, with Mr. Kirwan against.
Mr. Anderson of Illinois for, with Mr. Morse of Massachusetts against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bevill with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
Mr. Eilberg with Mr. Harrison.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Carter.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. O'Hara of Illinois with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Nichols with Mr. Moore.
Mr. Selden with Mr. Mathias of Maryland.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Andrews of Alabama with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Olsen.
Mr. Karsten with Mr. Landrum.
Mr. Holland with Mr. Hardy.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Hagan.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Watts.

Mr. DICKINSON and Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BELL and Mr. McCULLOCH changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN]. If he had been present, he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE]. If he had been present, he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 353, nays 37, answered "present" 2, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 123]

YEAS—353

Abbott	Albert	Andrews,
Abernethy	Anderson, Ill.	N. Dak.
Adams	Anderson,	Annunzio
Addabbo	Tenn.	Arends

Ashley
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Berry
Betts
Blester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Clark
Clausen,
Don H.
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Cowger
Cramer
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Dent
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Erlenborn
Esch
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fisher
Flood
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford,
William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallifanakis

Gallagher
Gardner
Glaimo
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gubser
Gude
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammer-
schmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kling, N.Y.
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kupferman
Kuykendall
Kyl
Kyros
Laird
Langen
Leggett
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McClary
McCloskey
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald,
Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald,
Mass.
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Meskill
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Mosher

Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Podell
Poff
Pollock
Pool
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Quie
Quillen
Rallsback
Randall
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Sandman
Satterfield
Schadeberg
Scherle
Scheuer
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan

Tuck
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watkins

Watson
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
Charles H.

Winn
Wolf
Wright
Wylder
Wyllie
Wyman
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—37

Ashbrook
Bennett
Bow
Brinkley
Brock
Buchanan
Clancy
Clawson, Del
Curtis
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Devine

Dickinson
Eshleman
Findley
Fino
Gathings
Goodell
Goodling
Gross
Grover
Jones, Mo.
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Joelson
Michel

NOT VOTING—41

Adair
Andrews, Ala.
Ashmore
Bevill
Brotzman
Carter
Corman
Cunningham
Dowdy
Edwards, Ala.
Eilberg
Flynt
Frelinghuysen
Garmatz

Gettys
Gibbons
Green, Ore.
Hagan
Halleck
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harrison
Hays
Herlong
Holland
Karsten
Kirwan
Landrum

MacGregor
Miller, Calif.
Moore
Morse, Mass.
Nichols
O'Hara, Ill.
Olsen
Pucinski
Purcell
Rhodes, Ariz.
Selden
Watts
Wyatt

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Moore for, with Mr. Michel against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Adair.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Morse.

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Cunningham.

Mr. Selden with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Ellberg with Mr. Carter.

Mr. Bevill with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.

Mr. Holland with Mr. Wyatt.

Mr. Pucinski with Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Harrison.

Mr. Gettys with Mr. Brotzman.

Mr. Hays with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Olsen with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. O'Hara of Illinois with Mr. Dowdy.

Mr. Nichols with Mr. Landrum.

Mr. Purcell with Mr. Karsten.

Mr. Hagan with Mr. Ashmore.

Mr. Hardy with Mr. Andrews of Alabama.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. COLLIER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore]. If he had been present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to

extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

YOUR NEW SOCIAL SECURITY

(Mr. ROONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the Social Security Amendments of 1967 now effective, approximately 24 million persons became eligible to receive more money. Through much publicity, the Social Security Administration has attempted to make these amendments understood by those entitled to the benefits; however, millions of Americans still do not understand them.

Many who could receive the new benefits will lose them, as many who are eligible for coverage under the old provisions continue to lose them, because they do not fully comprehend their rights to collect these benefits.

To many, the mentioning of social security brings to mind retirement and age 65. The largest group of recipients are the so-called old folks, but about 5½ million others are also affected by the new amendments.

If the parent of a child was under social security and is retired, dead, or disabled, that child is entitled to receive benefits while attending college and other schools up to his or her 22d birthday. Also, with the changes that have been made in the law, benefits can now be paid to persons disabled in childhood, before 18, who continue to be disabled. The benefits are payable when one of their parents receives social security retirement or disability benefits or when an insured parent dies.

Other groups under age 65 who are entitled to benefits are widows and children who get monthly survivors' insurance payments, and disabled workers and their families on disability insurance. Under survivors' insurance, monthly benefits can be paid to the widow and children of a worker under social security even though it was for only as little as a year and a half out of the 3 years before his death. One of the least known benefits included in survivors benefits is that every person covered by social security is entitled, after death, to a lump sum of from \$160 to \$255 to take care of funeral expenses.

One of the changes in disability insurance is particularly important to young families. It now makes benefits available to some workers before they reach 31, who could not have been eligible under the old law because they had not worked long enough under social security. As a result of this change, many young families became eligible for benefits in February of 1968.

The new law provides reduced benefits at age 50 for disabled widows, certain divorced wives, and disabled dependent widowers. They would have been eligible

90TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 17023

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 10, 1968

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

AN ACT

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for sundry inde-
5 pendent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corpora-
6 tions, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing
7 and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June
8 30, 1969, and for other purposes, namely:

1

TITLE I

2

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

3

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL

4

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5

For expenses necessary for the National Aeronautics and Space Council, established by section 201 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2471), including hire of passenger motor vehicles, reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services, and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$500,000.

12

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING

13

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

14

For expenses necessary for the Office of Emergency Planning, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services, hire of passenger motor vehicles, and expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and individuals at meetings concerned with the work of emergency planning, \$4,850,000.

21

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, TELECOMMUNICATIONS

22

For expenses necessary for the conduct of telecommunications functions assigned to the Director of Telecommunications Management, including services as authorized by 5

23

24

1 U.S.C. 3109, \$1,675,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed
2 \$500,000 of the foregoing amount shall remain available for
3 telecommunications studies and research until expended.

4 CIVIL DEFENSE AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION FUNCTIONS
5 OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

6 For expenses necessary to assist other Federal agencies
7 to perform civil defense and defense mobilization functions,
8 including payments by the Department of Labor to
9 State employment security agencies for the full cost of admin-
10 istration of defense manpower mobilization activities,
11 \$3,100,000.

12 OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
13 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

14 For expenses necessary for the Office of Science and
15 Technology, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C.
16 3109, \$1,750,000.

17 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT
18 APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

19 For expenses necessary to carry out the programs au-
20 thorized by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of
21 1965, as amended, except expenses authorized by section
22 105 of said Act, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C.
23 3109, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$168,600,000,
24 to remain available until expended.

1

DISASTER RELIEF

2

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1855-1855g) and section 9 of the Disaster Relief Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-769), authorizing assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed 3 per centum of the foregoing amount shall be available for administrative expenses.

10

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

11

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

12

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

13

For necessary expenses of the Federal Cochairman and his alternate on the Appalachian Regional Commission and for payment of the Federal share of the administrative expenses of the Commission, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$850,000.

19

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

20

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

21

For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board, including hire of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902);

1 and not to exceed \$1,000 for official reception and repre-
2 sentation expenses, \$9,350,000.

3 PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS (LIQUIDATION OF
4 CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

5 For payments to air carriers of so much of the compen-
6 sation fixed and determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board
7 under section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49
8 U.S.C. 1376), as is payable by the Board, \$45,000,000, to
9 remain available until expended.

10 CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

11 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

12 For necessary expenses, including services as authorized
13 by 5 U.S.C. 3109; not to exceed \$10,000 for medical exam-
14 inations performed for veterans by private physicians on a
15 fee basis; payment in advance for library membership in
16 societies whose publications are available to members only
17 or to members at a price lower than to the general public;
18 not to exceed \$161,000 for performing the duties imposed
19 upon the Commission by chapter 15 of title 5, United States
20 Code; and not to exceed \$1,000 for official reception and
21 representation expenses; \$37,000,000, including funding of
22 Interagency Boards of Examiners, together with not to exceed
23 \$6,460,000 for necessary expenses incurred during the cur-

1 rent fiscal year in the administration of the retirement and
2 insurance programs, to be transferred from the trust funds
3 “Civil Service retirement and disability fund”, “Employees
4 life insurance fund”, “Employees health benefits fund”, and
5 “Retired employees health benefits fund”, in such amounts as
6 may be determined by the Civil Service Commission, with-
7 out regard to the provisions of any other Act, but this pro-
8 vision shall not affect the authority of 5 U.S.C. 8348 (a) and
9 section 1 (b) of Public Law 89-205 (79 Stat. 840), pro-
10 viding for additional administrative expenses to effect an-
11 nuity adjustments under 5 U.S.C. 8340, section 1 (c) of
12 Public Law 89-205 (79 Stat. 840) and section 1 of
13 Public Law 89-314 (79 Stat. 1162): *Provided*, That
14 \$700,000 of this appropriation shall be available to carry
15 out the provisions of Executive Order 10422 of January 9,
16 1953, as amended, prescribing procedures for making avail-
17 able to the Secretary General of the United Nations, and the
18 executive heads of other international organizations, certain
19 information concerning United States citizens employed, or
20 being considered for employment by such organizations, in-
21 cluding advances or reimbursements to the applicable appro-
22 priations or funds of the Civil Service Commission and the
23 Federal Bureau of Investigation for expenses incurred by
24 such agencies under said Executive Order: *Provided further*,

1 That members of the International Organizations Employees
2 Loyalty Board may be paid actual transportation expenses,
3 and per diem in lieu of subsistence under 5 U.S.C. 5702,
4 while traveling on official business away from their homes or
5 regular places of business, including periods while en route
6 to and from and at the place where their services are to be
7 performed.

8 No part of the appropriations herein made to the Civil
9 Service Commission shall be available for the salaries and
10 expenses of the Legal Examining Unit in the Examining and
11 Personnel Utilization Division of the Commission, established
12 pursuant to Executive Order 9358 of July 1, 1943.

13 ANNUITIES UNDER SPECIAL ACTS

14 For payment of annuities authorized by the Act of
15 May 29, 1944, as amended (48 U.S.C. 1373a), and the Act
16 of August 19, 1950, as amended (33 U.S.C. 771-775),
17 \$1,350,000.

18 GOVERNMENT PAYMENT FOR ANNUITANTS, EMPLOYEES

19 HEALTH BENEFITS

20 For payment of Government contributions with respect
21 to retired employees, as authorized by chapter 89 of title 5,
22 United States Code, and the Retired Federal Employees
23 Health Benefits Act (74 Stat. 849), as amended, \$40,-
24 748,000, to remain available until expended.

1 PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND
2 DISABILITY FUND

3 For financing the estimated cost of new and increased
4 annuity benefits, during the current fiscal year, as provided
5 by part III of Public Law 87-793 (76 Stat. 868), \$72,000,-
6 000, to be credited to the civil service retirement and dis-
7 ability fund.

8 FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
9 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in performing the duties of the Commission as authorized by law, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902) ; not to exceed \$41,000 for land and structures; not to exceed \$11,000 for improvement and care of grounds and repairs to buildings; not to exceed \$500 for official reception and representation expenses; special counsel fees; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; and purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only, \$19,750,000.

19 FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION
20 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

21 For expenses necessary for the work of the Commission,
22 as authorized by law, including hire of passenger motor
23 vehicles, services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and not
24 to exceed \$500 for official reception and representation ex-
25 penses, \$15,000,000.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commission, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902), and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$16,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be expended upon any investigation hereafter provided by concurrent resolution of the Congress until funds are appropriated subsequently to the enactment of such resolution to finance the cost of such investigation.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

OPERATING EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of real property management and related activities as provided by law; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia; restoration of leased premises; moving Government agencies (including space adjustments) in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer of building space; acquisition by purchase or otherwise of real estate and interests therein; and contractual services incident to cleaning or servicing buildings and moving; \$271,881,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available to provide such fencing, lighting, guard booths, and other facilities

1 on private or other property not in Government ownership
2 or control as may be appropriate to enable the United
3 States Secret Service to perform its protective functions
4 pursuant to title 18, U.S.C. 3056.

5 REPAIR AND IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

6 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to
7 alter public buildings and to acquire additions to sites pursu-
8 ant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479) and
9 to alter other Federally-owned buildings and to acquire
10 additions to sites thereof, including grounds, approaches and
11 appurtenances, wharves and piers, together with the neces-
12 sary dredging adjacent thereto; and care and safeguarding of
13 sites; preliminary planning of projects by contract or other-
14 wise; maintenance, preservation, demolition, and equipment;
15 \$80,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*,
16 That for the purposes of this appropriation, buildings con-
17 structed pursuant to the Public Buildings Purchase Contract
18 Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356) and the Post Office Depart-
19 ment Property Act of 1954 (39 U.S.C. 2104 et seq.), and
20 buildings under the control of another department or agency
21 where alteration of such buildings is required in connection
22 with the moving of such other department or agency from
23 buildings then, or thereafter to be, under the control of Gen-
24 eral Services Administration shall be considered to be public
25 buildings.

1 SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

2 For an additional amount for expenses necessary in
3 connection with the construction of public buildings projects
4 not otherwise provided for, as specified under this head in
5 the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts of 1959 and
6 1960, including preliminary planning of public buildings
7 projects by contract or otherwise, \$10,995,000, to remain
8 available until expended.

9 PAYMENTS, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PURCHASE CONTRACTS

10 For payments of principal, interest, taxes, and any other
11 obligations under contracts entered into pursuant to the
12 Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C.
13 356), \$2,400,000.

14 EXPENSES, UNITED STATES COURT FACILITIES

15 For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, to
16 provide directly or indirectly, additional space for the United
17 States Courts incident to expansion of facilities (including
18 rental of buildings in the District of Columbia and elsewhere
19 and moving and space adjustments), and furniture and fur-
20 nishings, \$750,000.

21 OPERATING EXPENSES, FEDERAL SUPPLY SERVICE

22 For expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary for sup-
23 ply distribution, procurement, inspection, operation of the
24 stores depot system (including contractual services incident

1 to receiving, handling, and shipping warehouse items), and
2 other supply management and related activities, as authorized
3 by law, \$72,500,000.

4 OPERATING EXPENSES, NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND
5 RECORDS SERVICE

6 For necessary expenses in connection with Federal
7 records management and related activities, as provided by
8 law, including reimbursement for security guard services,
9 and contractual services incident to movement or disposal of
10 records, \$18,300,000.

11 NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS GRANTS

12 For allocation to Federal agencies, and for grants to
13 State and local agencies and nonprofit organizations and in-
14 stitutions, for the collecting, describing, preserving and com-
15 piling, and publishing of documentary sources significant to
16 the history of the United States, \$350,000, to remain avail-
17 able until expended.

18 OPERATING EXPENSES, TRANSPORTATION AND
19 COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE

20 For necessary expenses of transportation, communica-
21 tions, and other public utilities management and related
22 activities, as provided by law, including services as author-
23 ized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$6,150,000.

1 OPERATING EXPENSES, PROPERTY MANAGEMENT AND
2 DISPOSAL SERVICE

3 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary
4 for carrying out the functions of the Administrator with
5 respect to the utilization of excess property; the disposal
6 of surplus property; the rehabilitation of personal property;
7 the appraisal of real and personal property; the national
8 stockpile established by the Strategic and Critical Materials
9 Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98-98h) ; the supplemental
10 stockpile established by section 104 (b) of the Agricultural
11 Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat.
12 456, as amended by 73 Stat. 607) ; the national industrial
13 reserve established by the National Industrial Reserve Act
14 of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451-462) ; including services as
15 authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and reimbursement for
16 security guard services, \$28,500,000, to be derived from
17 proceeds from transfers of excess property, disposal of surplus
18 property, and sales of stockpile materials: *Provided*, That
19 during the current fiscal year the General Services Adminis-
20 tration is authorized to acquire leasehold interests in prop-
21 erty, for periods not in excess of twenty years, for the
22 storage, security, and maintenance of strategic, critical, and
23 other materials in the national and supplemental stockpiles

1 provided said leasehold interests are at nominal cost to the
2 Government: *Provided further*, That during the current
3 fiscal year there shall be no limitation on the value of surplus
4 strategic and critical materials which, in accordance with
5 section 6 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling
6 Act (50 U.S.C. 98e), may be transferred without reim-
7 bursement to the national stockpile: *Provided further*, That
8 during the current fiscal year materials in the inventory
9 maintained under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as
10 amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2061-2166), and excess ma-
11 terials in the national stockpile and the supplemental stock-
12 pile, the disposition of which is authorized by law, shall be
13 available, without reimbursement, for transfer at fair market
14 value to contractors as payment for expenses (including
15 transportation and other accessorial expenses) of acquisition
16 of materials, or of refining, processing, or otherwise bene-
17 ficiating materials, or of rotating materials, pursuant to sec-
18 tion 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling
19 Act (50 U.S.C. 98b), and of processing and refining ma-
20 terials pursuant to section 303 (d) of the Defense Production
21 Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2093 (d)).

22 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

23 For expenses of executive direction for activities under
24 the control of the General Services Administration, \$1,820,-

1 000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$500 shall be available
2 for reception and representation expenses.

3 ALLOWANCES AND OFFICE FACILITIES FOR FORMER
4 PRESIDENTS

5 For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August
6 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 838), \$267,000: *Provided*, That the
7 Administrator of General Services shall transfer to the Secre-
8 tary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to carry
9 out the provisions of sections (a) and (e) of such Act.

10 EXPENSES, PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION

11 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the
12 Presidential Transition Act of 1963 (3 U.S.C. 102, note),
13 \$900,000, to remain available until June 30, 1970.

14 ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS FUND

15 Funds available to General Services Administration for
16 administrative operations, in support of program activities,
17 shall be expended and accounted for, as a whole, through a
18 single fund: *Provided*, That costs and obligations for such
19 administrative operations for the respective program activ-
20 ities shall be accounted for in accordance with systems ap-
21 proved by the General Accounting Office: *Provided further*,
22 That the total amount deposited into said account for the cur-
23 rent fiscal year from funds made available to General Services
24 Administration in this Act shall not exceed \$13,700,000:

1 *Provided further,* That amounts deposited into said account
2 for administrative operations for each program shall not
3 exceed the amounts included in the respective program
4 appropriations for such purposes.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

6 The appropriate appropriation or fund available to the
7 General Services Administration shall be credited with (1)
8 cost of operation, protection, maintenance, upkeep, repair,
9 and improvement, included as part of rentals received from
10 Government corporations pursuant to law (40 U.S.C. 129);
11 (2) reimbursements for services performed in respect to
12 bonds and other obligations under the jurisdiction of the
13 General Services Administration, issued by public authori-
14 ties, States, or other public bodies, and such services in re-
15 spect to such bonds or obligations as the Administrator
16 deems necessary and in the public interest may, upon the
17 request and at the expense of the issuing agencies, be pro-
18 vided from the appropriate foregoing appropriation; and
19 (3) appropriations or funds available to other agencies, and
20 transferred to the General Services Administration, in con-
21 nection with property transferred to the General Services
22 Administration pursuant to the Act of July 2, 1948 (50
23 U.S.C. 451ff), and such appropriations or funds may be so
24 transferred, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

25 Appropriations to the General Services Administration

1 under the heading "Construction, Public Buildings Projects"
2 shall be available, subject to the provisions of the Public
3 Buildings Act of 1959 for (1) acquisition of buildings and
4 sites thereof by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, in-
5 cluding prepayment of purchase contracts, (2) extension or
6 conversion of Government-owned buildings, and (3) con-
7 struction of new buildings, in addition to those set forth under
8 that appropriation: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall
9 authorize an expenditure of funds for acquisition, extension or
10 conversion, or construction without the approval of the Com-
11 mittees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of
12 Representatives.

13 Funds available to the General Services Administration
14 shall be available for the hire of passenger motor vehicles.

15 No part of any money appropriated by this or any
16 other Act for any agency of the executive branch of the
17 Government shall be used during the current fiscal year for
18 the purchase within the continental limits of the United
19 States of any typewriting machines except in accordance
20 with regulations issued pursuant to the provisions of the
21 Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949,
22 as amended.

23 Not to exceed 2 per centum of any appropriation made
24 available to the General Services Administration for the

1 current fiscal year by this Act may be transferred to any
2 other such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be
3 increased thereby more than 2 per centum: *Provided*, That
4 such transfers shall apply only to operating expenses, and
5 shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount of \$2,000,000.

6 Appropriations available to any department or agency
7 during the current fiscal year for necessary expenses, includ-
8 ing maintenance or operating expenses, shall also be available
9 for (a) reimbursement to the General Services Administra-
10 tion for those expenses of renovation and alteration of build-
11 ings and facilities which constitute public improvements, per-
12 formed in accordance with the Public Buildings Act of 1959
13 (73 Stat. 479) or other applicable law, and (b) transfer or
14 reimbursement to applicable appropriations to said Adminis-
15 tration for rents and related expenses, not otherwise provided
16 for, of providing subject to Executive Order 11035, dated
17 July 9, 1962, directly or indirectly, suitable general purpose
18 space for any such department or agency, in the District of
19 Columbia or elsewhere.

20 No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall
21 be used for the payment of rental on lease agreements for the
22 accommodation of Federal agencies in buildings and improve-
23 ments which are to be erected by the lessor for such agencies
24 at an estimated cost of construction in excess of \$200,000 or
25 for the payment of the salary of any person who executes

1 such a lease agreement: *Provided*, That the foregoing proviso
2 shall not be applicable to projects for which a prospectus for
3 the lease construction of space has been submitted to the Con-
4 gress and approval made in the same manner as for the
5 public buildings construction projects pursuant to the Public
6 Buildings Act of 1959.

7 INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

8 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

9 For necessary expenses of the Interstate Commerce
10 Commission, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C.
11 3109, \$23,846,000: *Provided*, That Joint Board members
12 and cooperating State commissioners may use Government
13 transportation requests when traveling in connection with
14 their duties as such.

15 NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE

16 ADMINISTRATION

17 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

18 For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for,
19 including research, development, operations, services, minor
20 construction, supplies, materials, equipment; maintenance, re-
21 pair, and alteration of real and personal property; and pur-
22 chase, hire, maintenance, and operation of other than admin-
23 istrative aircraft necessary for the conduct and support of
24 aeronautical and space research and development activities of

1 the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, \$3,383,-
2 250,000, to remain available until expended.

3 CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

4 For advance planning, design, and construction of facili-
5 ties for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration,
6 and for the acquisition or condemnation of real property, as
7 authorized by law, \$21,800,000, to remain available until
8 expended.

9 ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS

10 For necessary expenses of operation of the National
11 Aeronautics and Space Administration, not otherwise pro-
12 vided for, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as au-
13 thorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902); minor construc-
14 tion; supplies, materials, services, and equipment; awards;
15 hire, maintenance and operation of administrative aircraft;
16 purchase (not to exceed ten for replacement only) and hire
17 of passenger motor vehicles; and maintenance, repair, and
18 alteration of real and personal property; \$603,173,000: *Pro-*
19 *vided*, That contracts may be entered into under this appro-
20 priation for maintenance and operation of facilities, and for
21 other services, to be provided during the next fiscal year.

22 GENERAL PROVISIONS

23 Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation made
24 available to the National Aeronautics and Space Adminis-
25 tration by this Act may be transferred to any other such
26 appropriation.

1 Not to exceed \$35,000 of the appropriation "Adminis-
2 trative Operations" in this Act for the National Aeronautics
3 and Space Administration shall be available for scientific
4 consultations or extraordinary expense, to be expended upon
5 the approval or authority of the Administrator and his deter-
6 mination shall be final and conclusive.

7 NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

8 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

9 For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the
10 National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42
11 U.S.C. 1861-1875) Title IX of the National Defense Edu-
12 cation Act of 1958 (42 U.S.C. 1876-1879), the National
13 Sea Grant Colleges and Program Act of 1966 (80 Stat.
14 998), and the Act to establish a National Medal of Science
15 (42 U.S.C. 1880-1881), including award of graduate fellow-
16 ships; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; maintenance
17 and operation of three aircraft and purchase of flight services
18 for research support; hire of passenger motor vehicles; not
19 to exceed \$2,500 for official reception and representation ex-
20 penses; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by
21 law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902); rental of conference rooms in
22 the District of Columbia; and reimbursement of the General
23 Services Administration for security guard services; \$400,-
24 000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That
25 of the foregoing amount not less than \$37,600,000 shall be
26 available for tuition, grants, and allowances in connection

1 with a program of supplementary training for secondary
2 school science and mathematics teachers: *Provided further,*
3 That receipts for scientific support services and materials
4 furnished by the National Research Centers may be credited
5 to this appropriation: *And provided further,* That no part
6 of this appropriation shall be available for or paid out to
7 the benefit of any individual who at any time after the
8 effective date of this Act, wilfully refuses to obey a lawful
9 regulation of the university or college which he is attending
10 or at which he is employed.

11 RENEGOTIATION BOARD

12 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

13 For necessary expenses of the Renegotiation Board, in-
14 cluding hire of passenger motor vehicles and services as
15 authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$3,000,000.

16 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

17 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

18 For necessary expenses, including uniforms or allow-
19 ances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902),
20 and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$17,730,000.

21 SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

22 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

23 For expenses necessary for the operation and mainte-
24 nance of the Selective Service System, as authorized by title
25 I of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 (62 Stat.
26 604), as amended, including services as authorized by 5

1 U.S.C. 3109; expenses of attendance at meetings and of
2 training for uniformed personnel assigned to the Selective
3 Service System, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2301-
4 2318) for civilian employees; hire of motor vehicles; pur-
5 chase of thirteen passenger motor vehicles for replacement
6 only; not to exceed \$71,000 for the National Selective Serv-
7 ice Appeal Board; and \$60,000 for the National Advisory
8 Committee on the Selection of Physicians, Dentists, and
9 Allied Specialists; \$63,568,000: *Provided*, That during the
10 current fiscal year, the President may exempt this appro-
11 priation from the provisions of subsection (c) of section
12 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, whenever he
13 deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national
14 defense.

15 VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

16 COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

17 For the payment of compensation, pensions, gratuities,
18 and allowances, including burial awards, burial flags, sub-
19 sistence allowances for vocational rehabilitation, emergency
20 and other officers' retirement pay, adjusted-service credits
21 and certificates, as authorized by law; and for payment of
22 amounts of compromises or settlements under 28 U.S.C.
23 2677 of tort claims potentially subject to the offset provisions
24 of 38 U.S.C. 351, \$4,654,336,000, to remain available until
25 expended.

1 READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

2 For the payment of readjustment and rehabilitation
3 benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by law (38
4 U.S.C. chapters 21, 31 (except section 1504), and 33-39),
5 \$612,000,000, to remain available until expended.

6 VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

7 For military and naval insurance, national service life
8 insurance, servicemen's indemnities, and service-disabled
9 veterans insurance, to remain available until expended,
10 \$11,850,000, of which \$2,500,000 shall be derived from the
11 Veterans Special Term Insurance Fund.

12 MEDICAL CARE

For expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of hospitals, nursing homes, and domiciliary facilities; for furnishing, as authorized by law, inpatient and outpatient care and treatment to beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration including care and treatment in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration, and furnishing recreational facilities, supplies and equipment; maintenance and operation of farms and burial grounds; repairing, altering, improving or providing facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration, not otherwise provided for, either by contract or by the hire of temporary employees and pur-

1 chase of materials; uniforms or allowance therefor as author-
2 ized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902) ; and aid to State homes
3 as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 641) ; \$1,420,264,000,
4 plus reimbursements: *Provided*, That allotments and trans-
5 fers may be made from this appropriation to the Public
6 Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and
7 Welfare, and the Army, Navy, and Air Force of the De-
8 partment of Defense, for disbursements by them under the
9 various headings of their applicable appropriations, of such
10 amounts as are necessary for the care and treatment of bene-
11 ficiaries of the Veterans Administration.

12 MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH

13 For expenses necessary for carrying out programs of
14 medical and prosthetic research and development, as author-
15 ized by law, to remain available until expended, \$45,850,-
16 000.

17 MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS

18 OPERATING EXPENSES

19 For expenses necessary for administration of the medical,
20 hospital, domiciliary, construction and supply, research,
21 employee education and training activities, as authorized by
22 law, and for carrying out the provisions of section 5055, title
23 38, United States Code, relating to pilot programs and grants
24 for exchange of medical information, \$14,200,000.

1 GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

2 For necessary operating expenses of the Veterans Ad-
3 ministration, not otherwise provided for, including uniforms
4 or allowances therefor, as authorized by law; not to exceed
5 \$1,000 for official reception and representation expenses;
6 purchase of one passenger motor vehicle (medium sedan
7 for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles;
8 and reimbursement of the General Services Administration
9 for security guard services; \$195,000,000: *Provided*, That
10 no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay in excess of
11 twenty-two persons engaged in public relations work.

12 CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY
13 FACILITIES

14 For hospital and domiciliary facilities, for planning and
15 for major alterations, improvements, and repairs and extend-
16 ing any of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the Veterans
17 Administration or for any of the purposes set forth in sections
18 5001, 5002, and 5004, title 38, United States Code, includ-
19 ing necessary expenses of administration, \$7,926,000, to
20 remain available until expended.

21 GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF STATE NURSING HOMES

22 For grants to assist the several States to construct State
23 home facilities for furnishing nursing home care to veterans,
24 as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 5031-5037), \$4,000,000.
25 to remain available until June 30, 1971.

1 GRANTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

2 For payment to the Republic of the Philippines of
3 grants, as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 631-634),
4 \$1,776,000.

5 LOAN GUARANTY REVOLVING FUND

6 During the current fiscal year, the Loan guaranty revolv-
7 ing fund shall be available for expenses, but not to exceed
8 \$450,000,000, for property acquisitions and other loan guar-
9 anty and insurance operations under Chapter 37, title 38,
10 United States Code, except administrative expenses, as au-
11 thorized by section 1824 of such title: *Provided*, That the
12 unobligated balances including retained earnings of the Direct
13 loan revolving fund shall be available, during the current
14 fiscal year, for transfer to the Loan guaranty revolving fund
15 in such amounts as may be necessary to provide for the
16 timely payment of obligations of such fund and the Admin-
17 istrator of Veterans Affairs shall not be required to pay inter-
18 est on amounts so transferred after the time of such transfer.

19 PAYMENT OF PARTICIPATION SALES INSUFFICIENCIES

20 For the payment of such insufficiencies as may be re-
21 quired by the Federal National Mortgage Association, as
22 trustee, on account of outstanding beneficial interests or par-
23 ticipations in Direct Loan Revolving Fund assets or Loan
24 Guaranty Revolving Fund assets authorized by law to be

1 issued pursuant to section 302 (c) of the Federal National
2 Mortgage Association Charter Act, as amended, \$9,505,000.

3 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

4 Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation for the
5 current fiscal year for "Compensation and pensions", "Re-
6 adjustment benefits", and "Veterans insurance and indemni-
7 ties" may be transferred to any other of the mentioned ap-
8 propriations, but not to exceed 10 per centum of the appro-
9 priations so augmented.

10 Appropriations available to the Veterans Administra-
11 tion for the current fiscal year for salaries and expenses
12 shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C.
13 3109.

14 The appropriation available to the Veterans Administra-
15 tion for the current fiscal year for "Medical care" shall be
16 available for funeral, burial, and other expenses incidental
17 thereto (except burial awards authorized by 38 U.S.C. 902),
18 for beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration receiving
19 care under such appropriations.

20 No part of the appropriations in this Act for the Veter-
21 ans Administration (except the appropriation for "Construc-
22 tion of hospital and domiciliary facilities") shall be available
23 for the purchase of any site for or toward the construction
24 of any new hospital or home.

25 No part of the foregoing appropriations shall be avail-

1 able for hospitalization or examination of any persons except
2 beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such benefits
3 to veterans, unless reimbursement of cost is made to the ap-
4 propriation at such rates as may be fixed by the Administra-
5 tor of Veterans Affairs.

6 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

7 CIVIL DEFENSE

8 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

9 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for
10 carrying out civil defense activities, including the hire of
11 motor vehicles; and financial contributions to the States for
12 civil defense purposes, as authorized by law, \$48,040,000,
13 and in addition, \$500,000 which shall be derived by transfer
14 from Civil Defense Procurement Fund established by the
15 Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (50 U.S.C.
16 App. 2264) : *Provided*, That not to exceed \$18,500,000
17 shall be available for allocation under section 205 of the Fed-
18 eral Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended.

19 RESEARCH, SHELTER SURVEY AND MARKING

20 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for
21 studies and research to develop measures and plans for civil
22 defense; and continuing shelter surveys, marking, stocking,
23 and equipping surveyed spaces; \$10,000,000, to remain
24 available until expended.

1 GENERAL PROVISIONS—CIVIL DEFENSE

2 Appropriations contained in this Act for carrying out
3 civil defense activities shall not be available in excess of the
4 limitations on appropriations contained in section 408 of the
5 Federal Civil Defense Act, as amended (50 U.S.C. App.
6 2260).

7 No part of any appropriation in this Act shall be
8 available for the construction of warehouses or for the lease
9 of warehouse space in any building which is to be constructed
10 specifically for civil defense activities.

11 DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN

12 DEVELOPMENT

13 RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE

14 HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY OR HANDICAPPED FUND

15 For the revolving fund established pursuant to section
16 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended (12 U.S.C.
17 1701q et seq.), \$25,000,000, to remain available until
18 expended.

19 ALASKA HOUSING

20 For assistance in the provision of housing and related
21 facilities for Alaska natives and other Alaska residents, as
22 authorized by section 1004 of the Demonstration Cities and
23 Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (80 Stat. 1284–
24 1285), \$1,000,000.

1 GRANTS FOR NEIGHBORHOOD FACILITIES

2 For grants authorized by section 703 of the Housing
3 and Urban Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3103),
4 \$35,000,000, to remain available until expended.

5 LOW RENT PUBLIC HOUSING ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

6 For the payment of annual contributions to public hous-
7 ing agencies in accordance with section 10 of the United
8 States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1410),
9 \$350,000,000.

10 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

11 For necessary administrative expenses of programs of
12 renewal and housing assistance, not otherwise provided for,
13 \$34,000,000.

14 METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT

15 URBAN PLANNING GRANTS

16 For an additional amount for "Urban planning grants",
17 \$38,838,000, to remain available until expended.

18 OPEN SPACE LAND PROGRAMS

19 For grants as authorized by title VII of the Housing
20 Act of 1961, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1500-1500e), and the
21 provision of technical assistance to State and local public
22 bodies (including the undertaking of studies and publication
23 of information), \$75,000,000, to remain available until ex-
24 pended: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation in this

1 Act shall be used for administrative expenses in connection
2 with commitments entered into during the current fiscal
3 year for grants aggregating more than the total amounts
4 available in the current year from amounts heretofore appro-
5 priated for making such commitments through June 30,
6 1967, plus the additional amount appropriated herein: *Pro-*
7 *vided further*, That no part of this appropriation may be
8 used for financing a grant in excess of 50 per centum of the
9 cost of any activity or project.

10 GRANTS FOR BASIC WATER AND SEWER FACILITIES

11 For grants authorized by section 702 of the Housing
12 and Urban Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3102),
13 \$150,000,000, to remain available until expended.

14 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

15 For necessary administrative expenses of programs of
16 metropolitan development, not otherwise provided for,
17 \$7,000,000.

18 DEMONSTRATIONS AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

19 MODEL CITIES PROGRAMS

20 For financial assistance and administrative expenses in
21 connection with planning and carrying out comprehensive
22 city demonstration programs, as authorized by title I of the
23 Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act
24 of 1966 (80 Stat. 1255-1261), including \$100,000,000
25 for grants for urban renewal projects within approved city

1 demonstration programs, to be transferred to and merged
2 with the appropriation "Urban renewal programs" for the
3 fiscal year 1969 in accordance with and subject to the provi-
4 sions of section 113 of said Act, \$500,000,000: *Provided*,
5 That the amount appropriated herein for other than urban
6 renewal programs shall remain available until June 30, 1970.

7 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT TRAINING PROGRAMS

8 For matching grants to States for training and related
9 activities, and for expenses of providing technical assistance
10 to State and local governmental or public bodies (including
11 studies and publication of information), as authorized by
12 title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964 (20 U.S.C. 801-
13 805), \$3,000,000.

14 FELLOWSHIPS FOR CITY PLANNING AND URBAN STUDIES

15 For fellowships for city planning and urban studies as
16 authorized by section 810 of the Housing Act of 1964 (20
17 U.S.C. 811), \$500,000.

18 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

19 For necessary administrative expenses of programs of
20 demonstrations and intergovernmental relations, not other-
21 wise provided for, \$1,860,000, together with not to exceed
22 \$6,000,000 to be derived from the appropriation for "Model
23 cities programs": *Provided*, That no part of this or any other
24 appropriation in this Act may be used to provide metro-
25 politan expeditors, or for the administration or implementa-

tion of section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-754).

URBAN RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

For necessary expenses of programs of research and studies relating to housing and urban problems, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by law (12 U.S.C. 1701d-3; 1701e; 1701f; 79 Stat. 668; 80 Stat. 1286-1287), \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$500,000 of the foregoing amount shall be available for administrative expenses.

LOW INCOME HOUSING DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS

For low income housing demonstration programs pursuant to section 207 of the Housing Act of 1961, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1436), \$2,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation in this Act shall be available for administrative expenses in connection with contracts to make grants in excess of the amount herein appropriated.

MORTGAGE CREDIT

RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM

For rent supplement payments authorized by section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, \$12,000,000: *Provided*, That the limitation otherwise applicable to the maximum payments that may be required in any fiscal year by all contracts entered into under such section is increased by \$25,000,000: *Provided further*, That

1 no part of the foregoing appropriation or contract authority
2 shall be used for incurring any obligation in connection with
3 any dwelling unit or project which is not either part of a
4 workable program for community improvement meeting the
5 requirements of section 101 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949,
6 as amended (42 U.S.C. 1451 (c)), or which is without
7 local official approval for participation in this program.

8 For necessary administrative expenses of the Federal
9 Housing Administration in carrying out functions under sec-
10 tion 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of
11 1965, delegated by the Secretary, \$1,350,000.

12 DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

13 GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

14 For necessary administrative expenses of the Secretary,
15 not otherwise provided for, in overall program planning
16 and direction in the Department, including not to exceed
17 \$2,500 for official reception and representation expenses,
18 \$6,000,000.

19 REGIONAL MANAGEMENT AND SERVICES

20 For necessary administrative expenses, not otherwise
21 provided for, of management and program coordination in
22 the regional offices of the Department, \$6,500,000.

23 PAYMENT OF PARTICIPATION SALES INSUFFICIENCIES

24 For the payment of such insufficiencies as may be re-
25 quired by the Federal National Mortgage Association, as

1 trustee, on account of outstanding beneficial interests or par-
2 ticipations in assets of the Department of Housing and Urban
3 Development (including the Federal National Mortgage
4 Association) authorized by law to be issued pursuant to sec-
5 tion 302 (c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association
6 Charter Act, as amended, \$47,638,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

8 SEC. 102. Where appropriations in this title are expend-
9 able for travel expenses of employees and no specific limita-
10 tion has been placed thereon, the expenditures for such travel
11 expenses may not exceed the amounts set forth therefor in
12 the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations: *Pro-*
13 *vided*, That this section shall not apply to travel performed
14 by uncompensated officials of local boards and appeal boards
15 of the Selective Service System; to travel performed in con-
16 nection with the investigation of aircraft accidents by the
17 Civil Aeronautics Board; to travel performed directly in con-
18 nection with care and treatment of medical beneficiaries of
19 the Veterans Administration; or to payments to interagency
20 motor pool where separately set forth in the budget schedules.

SEC. 103. No part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be available to pay the salary of any person filling a position, other than a temporary position, formerly held by an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces of the United States and has satisfactorily completed his period of

1 active military or naval service and has within ninety days
2 after his release from such service or from hospitalization con-
3 tinuing after discharge for a period of not more than one year
4 made application for restoration to his former position and
5 has been certified by the Civil Service Commission as still
6 qualified to perform the duties of his former position and has
7 not been restored thereto.

8 SEC. 104. No part of any appropriation made available
9 by the provisions of this title shall be used for the purchase
10 or sale of real estate or for the purpose of establishing new
11 offices outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That this
12 limitation shall not apply to programs which have been
13 approved by the Congress and appropriations made therefor.

14 TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

15 The following corporations and agencies, respectively,
16 are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within
17 the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each
18 such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to
19 make such contracts and commitments without regard to
20 fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the
21 Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may
22 be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the
23 Budget for the current fiscal year for each such corporation
24 or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

1 FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD
2 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRA-
3 TIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK
4 BOARD

5 Not to exceed a total of \$5,000,000 shall be available
6 for administrative expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank
7 Board, which may procure services as authorized by 5 U.S.C.
8 3109, and contracts for such services with one organization
9 may be renewed annually, and uniforms or allowances there-
10 for in accordance with law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902) , and said
11 amount shall be derived from funds available to the Federal
12 Home Loan Bank Board, including those in the Federal
13 Home Loan Bank Board revolving fund and receipts of the
14 Board for the current fiscal year and prior fiscal years, and
15 the Board may utilize and may make payment for services
16 and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal
17 Reserve banks, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance
18 Corporation, and other agencies of the Government (includ-
19 ing payment for office space) : *Provided*, That all necessary
20 expenses in connection with the conservatorship of institu-
21 tions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance
22 Corporation or activities relating to section 6 (i) of the Fed-
23 eral Home Loan Bank Act, section 5 (d) of the Home Own-
24 ers' Loan Act of 1933, or section 407 or 408 of the National
25 Housing Act and all necessary expenses (including services

1 performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other
2 personal services) in connection with the handling, including
3 the purchase, sale, and exchange, of securities on behalf of
4 Federal home-loan banks, and the sale, issuance, and retire-
5 ment of, or payment of interest on, debentures or bonds, under
6 the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, shall be con-
7 sidered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof:
8 *Provided further*, That members and alternates of the Federal
9 Savings and Loan Advisory Council shall be entitled to reim-
10 bursement from the Board as approved by the Board for
11 transportation expenses incurred in attendance at meetings of
12 or concerned with the work of such Council and may be paid
13 not to exceed \$25 per diem in lieu of subsistence: *Provided*
14 *further*, That expenses of any functions of supervision (ex-
15 cept of Federal home-loan banks) vested in or exercisable
16 by the Board shall be considered as nonadministrative ex-
17 penses: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$1,000 shall be
18 available for official reception and representation expenses:
19 *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provisions
20 of this Act, except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore
21 specified, the administrative expenses and other obligations
22 of the Board shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accord-
23 ance with the provisions of the Federal Home Loan Bank
24 Act of July 22, 1932, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1421-1449) :
25 *Provided further*, That the nonadministrative expenses (ex-

cept those included in the first proviso hereof) for the supervision and examination of Federal and State chartered institutions (other than special examinations determined by the Board to be necessary) shall not exceed \$14,396,000.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

Not to exceed \$340,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis and shall be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation, properly capitalized expenditures, expenses in connection with liquidation of insured institutions or activities relating to section 407 or 408 of the National Housing Act, liquidation or handling of assets of or derived from insured institutions, payment of insurance, and action for or toward the avoidance, termination, or minimizing of losses in the case of insured institutions, legal fees and expenses, and payments for expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board determined by said Board to be properly allocable to said Corporation, and said Corporation may utilize and may make payments for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and other agencies of the Government: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the

1 administrative expenses and other obligations of said Cor-
2 poration shall be incurred, allowed and paid in accordance
3 with title IV of the Act of June 27, 1934, as amended (12
4 U.S.C. 1724-1730b).

5 DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN

6 DEVELOPMENT

7 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, HOUSING

8 FOR THE ELDERLY OR HANDICAPPED

9 Not to exceed \$1,272,000 of funds in the revolving fund
10 established pursuant to section 202 of the Housing Act of
11 1959, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701q et seq.), shall be
12 available for administrative expenses.

13 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, COLLEGE

14 HOUSING LOANS

15 Not to exceed \$2,275,000 shall be available for all ad-
16 ministrative expenses of carrying out the program of housing
17 loans to educational institutions (12 U.S.C. 1749-1749d).

18 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, PUBLIC

19 FACILITY LOANS

20 Not to exceed \$1,227,000 of funds in the revolving fund
21 established pursuant to title II of the Housing Amendments
22 of 1955, as amended, shall be available for administrative
23 expenses.

1 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, REVOLVING
2 FUND (LIQUIDATING PROGRAMS)

3 During the current fiscal year not to exceed \$100,000
4 shall be available for administrative expenses, but this amount
5 shall be exclusive of expenses necessary in the case of de-
6 faulted obligations to protect the interests of the Government.

7 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRA-
8 TIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

9 For administrative expenses in carrying out duties im-
10 posed by or pursuant to law, not to exceed \$11,500,000 of
11 the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration
12 shall be available, in accordance with the National Housing
13 Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701) : *Provided*, That funds
14 shall be available for contract actuarial services (not to ex-
15 ceed \$1,500) : *Provided further*, That nonadministrative
16 expenses classified by section 2 of Public Law 387, approved
17 October 25, 1949, shall not exceed \$92,000,000.

18 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL
19 NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

20 Not to exceed \$10,000,000 shall be available for admin-
21 istrative expenses, which shall be on accrual basis, and shall
22 be exclusive of interest paid, expenses (including expenses
23 for fiscal agency services performed on a contract or fee
24 basis) in connection with the issuance and servicing of se-
25 curities, depreciation, properly capitalized expenditures, fees

1 for servicing mortgages, expenses (including services per-
2 formed on a force account, contract or fee basis, but not in-
3 cluding other personal services) in connection with the ac-
4 quisition, protection, operation, maintenance, improvement,
5 or disposition of real or personal property belonging to said
6 Association or in which it has an interest, cost of salaries,
7 wages, travel, and other expenses of persons employed out-
8 side of the continental United States, and all administrative
9 expenses reimbursable from other Government agencies:

10 *Provided*, That the distribution of administrative expenses
11 to the accounts of the Association shall be made in accordance
12 with generally recognized accounting principles and practices.

13 ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, LOW RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

14 Administrative expenses of carrying out the provisions
15 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42
16 U.S.C. 1401-1433) shall be provided for from amounts
17 appropriated therefor in this Act, except that necessary
18 expenses of providing representatives at the sites of non-
19 Federal projects in connection with the construction of such
20 projects by public housing agencies with aid under the
21 United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, shall be
22 compensated by such agencies by the payment of fixed fees
23 which in the aggregate will cover the costs of rendering such
24 services, and expenditures for such purpose shall be con-
25 sidered nonadministrative expenses, and funds received from

1 such payments may be used only for the payment of neces-
2 sary expenses of providing such representatives.

3 TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

4 SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this
5 Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any cor-
6 poration or agency included in this Act, shall be used for
7 publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or de-
8 feat legislation pending before the Congress.

9 SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in
10 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any
11 corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used to
12 pay the compensation of any employee engaged in person-
13 nel work in excess of the number that would be provided
14 by a ratio of one such employee to one hundred and thirty-
15 five, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent
16 employees of the corporation or agency concerned: *Pro-*
17 *vided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be
18 considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half-
19 time or more in personnel administration consisting of direc-
20 tion and administration of the personnel program; employ-
21 ment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classifi-
22 cation; employee relations and services; wage administra-
23 tion; and processing, recording, and reporting.

24 SEC. 303. Appropriations and funds available for the
25 administrative expenses of the Department of Housing and

1 Urban Development shall be available in the current fiscal
2 year for purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as au-
3 thorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902) ; hire of passenger
4 motor vehicles ; and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

5 SEC. 304. Funds made available for the Department of
6 Housing and Urban Development under title II of this Act
7 shall be available, without regard to the limitations on admin-
8 istrative expenses, for legal services on a contract or fee
9 basis, and for utilizing and making payment for services and
10 facilities of Federal National Mortgage Association, Fed-
11 eral Reserve banks or any member thereof, Federal home-
12 loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the
13 Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended
14 (12 U.S.C. 1811-1831).

15 SEC. 305. None of the funds provided herein shall be
16 used to pay any recipient of a grant for the conduct of a re-
17 search project an amount equal to as much as the entire cost
18 of such project.

19 SEC. 306. No part of any appropriation contained in this
20 Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the cur-
21 rent fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

22 SEC. 307. None of the funds in this Act shall be avail-
23 able to finance interdepartmental boards, commissions,
24 councils, committees, or similar groups under sec. 214 of the

1 Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1946 (31 U.S.C.
2 691) which do not have prior and specific Congressional
3 approval of such method of financial support.

4 SEC. 308. No part of the funds appropriated by this
5 Act shall be used to pay the salary of any Federal employee
6 who is convicted in any Federal, State, or local court of
7 competent jurisdiction, of inciting, promoting, or carrying
8 on a riot, or any group activity resulting in material damage
9 to property or injury to persons, found to be in violation
10 of Federal, State, or local laws designed to protect persons
11 or property in the community concerned.

12 This Act may be cited as the "Independent Offices and
13 Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropria-
14 tion Act, 1969".

Passed the House of Representatives May 8, 1968.

Attest:

W. PAT JENNINGS,

Clerk.

AN ACT

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

MAY 10, 1968

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Appropriations

June 27, 1968

4865, amended, to establish a system of nationwide trails; and S. 6, amended, authorization to operate, construct, and maintain the first stage of the Oahe unit, James Division, Missouri River Basin project, S. Dak. p. D614

9. HIGHWAYS. The "Daily Digest" states the Rules Committee "granted an open rule ...on H. R. 17134, the 1970-71 highway construction authorization." p. D614
 10. HOUSING. The "Daily Digest" states the Rules Committee "granted an open rule ...on H. R. 17989, to assist in the provision of housing for low- and moderate-income families, and to extend and amend laws relating to housing and urban development." p. D614
 11. DEFENSE PRODUCTION. Concurred in Senate amendments to H. R. 17268, to extend the Defense Production Act for two years, from June 30, 1968, to June 30, 1970, and to require the Comptroller General to formulate uniform accounting standards for all negotiated prime contract and subcontract defense procurements in excess of \$100,000, including standards from which production costs and profits by individual order can be accurately determined and within 18 months of the enactment of the bill, to recommend legislation to put the uniform accounting standards into effect (p. S5715). This bill will now be sent to the President.
 12. TAXATION; EXPENDITURES. Rep. Smith, Okla., explained why he voted against the revenue expenditure control bill. pp. H5788-9
 13. CONSERVATION. Conferees were given until Sat., midnight, June 29, to file a report on S. 1401, to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. pp. H5719-20
 14. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Albert announced the legislative program for next week as follows: on Monday the National School Lunch Act bills, Cradle of Forestry, Federal employees leave for funerals of certain relatives and for National Guard duty bills and proposed Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968. On Tuesday and the balance of the week: the Transportation Department appropriation bill and marketing orders on pears for canning or freezing bill. p. H5753
- SENATE
-
15. APPROPRIATIONS. A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee approved for full committee action with amendments H. R. 17023, 1969 appropriations for independent agencies and HUD. p. D610
 16. OCEANOGRAPHY; WEIGHTS AND MEASURES. The Commerce Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 13781, to authorize funds for sea-grant colleges and ocean exploration and H. R. 3136, to authorize a study on the increased use of the metric system in the U. S. p. D610
 17. TRANSPORTATION. A subcommittee of the Commerce Committee approved for full committee action S. 751, to require establishment of through routes and joint rates between motor carriers and other common carriers. p. D610

18. FLOOD CONTROL; POLLUTION; HIGHWAYS; WATERSHEDS. The Public Works Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) the following: An original omnibus rivers and harbors flood control bill; S. 2525, to control pollution from vessels within navigable waters; S. 3418, 1970-71 highway authorization bill (reconsidered and approved with additional amendments); and several watershed projects. p. D611

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

19. 4-H CLUBS. Rep. Giaimo inserted an article on 4-H activities in the city. p. E5889
20. HOUSING. Rep. Culver inserted an editorial supporting proposed housing bill. p. E5890
Rep. Rooney/^{Pa.} inserted HUD Secretary Weaver's speech explaining provisions of the proposed housing bill. pp. E5905-6
21. FEDERAL AID. Rep. Ashbrook praised Rep. Roth's study on federal aid. p. E5891
22. EMPLOYMENT. Rep. Wolff inserted an article on a Long Island Company's effort to fight poverty by training youths for jobs. p. E5895
23. TAXATION. Several Reps. praised and others opposed the revenue-expenditure control package. pp. E5896, E5925, E5929-30, E5952-4, E5911-2, E5935-6, E5968-9
24. NATIONAL PARK. Rep. Cohelan and Rep. Ottingen inserted articles supporting a National Redwood Park. pp. E5900-1, E5954-5
25. HUNGER. Rep. Gathings inserted an editorial critical of CBS' documentary on hunger. p. E5912
26. TRAINING; FARMING. Rep. Jones, N. C., spoke in favor of vocational agriculture. p. E5914
27. FARM INCOME. Rep. Zwack inserted an editorial on lack of "growth" in agricultural sector. p. E5921
28. FOREIGN AID. Rep. Hanna inserted an article showing the need and the opportunity for private resources to invest in our foreign aid program. pp. E5956-7
29. ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. O'Konski inserted resolutions of the Wisc. Electric Cooperative suggesting programs which result in continued growth of rural electric cooperatives. p. E5907

BILLS INTRODUCED

30. LANDS. H. R. 18210 by Rep. Randall, to regulate the granting of permits for private use of publicly owned lands within the District of Columbia; to District of Columbia Committee. Remarks of author p. H5782
H. R. 18211 by Rep. Randall, to regulate the granting of permits for private

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Long, Speedy O., <i>La</i> -----	Quillen, James H. (Jimmy), <i>Tenn.</i> -----	Udall, Morris K., <i>Ariz</i> -----
Lukens, Donald E., <i>Ohio</i> ---	Railsback, Tom, <i>Ill</i> -----	Ullman, Al, <i>Oreg</i> -----
McCarthy, Richard D., <i>N.Y.</i> ---	Randall, Wm. J., <i>Mo</i> -----	Utt, James B., <i>Calif</i> -----
McClory, Robert, <i>Ill</i> -----	Rarick, John R., <i>La</i> -----	Van Deerlin, Llonel, <i>Calif</i> ---
McCloskey, Paul N., Jr., <i>Calif.</i> -----	Rees, Thomas M., <i>Calif</i> ---	Vander Jagt, Guy, <i>Mich</i> ---
McClure, James A., <i>Idaho</i> ---	Reid, Charlotte T., <i>Ill</i> -----	Vanik, Charles A., <i>Ohio</i> ---
McCormack, John W., <i>Mass</i> ---	Reld, Ogden R., <i>N.Y.</i> -----	Vigorito, Joseph P., <i>Pa</i> -----
McCulloch, William M., <i>Ohio</i> -----	Relfel, Ben, <i>S. Dak</i> -----	Waggoner, Joe D., Jr., <i>La</i> ---
McDade, Joseph M., <i>Pa</i> -----	Reinecke, Ed, <i>Calif</i> -----	Waldie, Jerome R., <i>Calif</i> ---
McDonald, Jack H., <i>Mich</i> ---	Resnick, Joseph Y., <i>N.Y.</i> ---	Walker, E. S. Johnny, <i>N. Mex.</i> -----
McEwen, Robert C., <i>N.Y.</i> ---	Reuss, Henry S., <i>Wis</i> -----	Wampler, William C., <i>Va</i> ---
McFall, John J., <i>Calif</i> -----	Rhodes, George M., <i>Pa</i> -----	Watkins, G. Robert, <i>Pa</i> ---
McMillan, John L., <i>S.C.</i> ---	3508 Silver Park Dr., Apt. 7, Wash- ington 23, D.C.	Watson, Albert W., <i>S.C.</i> ---
Macdonald, Torbert H., <i>Mass.</i> -----	Rhodes, John J., <i>Ariz</i> -----	Watts, John C., <i>Ky</i> -----
MacGregor, Clark, <i>Minn</i> ---	Riegle, Donald W., Jr., <i>Mich.</i> -----	Whalen, Charles W., Jr., <i>Ohio</i> -----
Machen, Hervey G., <i>Md</i> -----	Rivers, L. Mendel, <i>S.C.</i> ---	Whalley, J. Irving, <i>Pa</i> -----
Madden, Ray J., <i>Ind</i> -----	Roberts, Ray, <i>Tex</i> -----	White, Richard, <i>Tex</i> -----
Mahon, George H., <i>Tex</i> -----	7414 Park Terrace Dr., Alexandria, Va.	Whitener, Basil L., <i>N.C.</i> ---
1200 N. Nash St., Arlington, Va.	Robison, Howard W., <i>N.Y.</i> ---	Whitten, Jamie L., <i>Miss</i> ---
Mailliard, William S., <i>Calif</i> ---	Rodino, Peter W., Jr., <i>N.J.</i> ---	5804 Nebraska Ave.
Marsh, John O., Jr., <i>Va</i> -----	Rogers, Byron G., <i>Colo</i> ---	Widnall, William B., <i>N.J.</i> ---
Martin, Dave, <i>Nebr</i> -----	Rogers, Paul G., <i>Fla</i> -----	Wiggins, Charles E., <i>Calif</i> ---
Mathias, Charles McC., Jr., <i>Md.</i> -----	4200 Cathedral Ave., Apt. 212A	Williams, Lawrence G., <i>Pa</i> ---
Mathias, Robert B. (Bob), <i>Calif.</i> -----	Ronan, Daniel J., <i>Ill</i> -----	Willis, Edwin E., <i>La</i> -----
Matsunaga, Spark M., <i>Hawaii</i> -----	Rooney, Fred B., <i>Pa</i> -----	Wilson, Bob, <i>Calif</i> -----
May, Catherine, <i>Wash</i> -----	Rooney, John J., <i>N.Y.</i> -----	Wilson, Charles H., <i>Calif</i> ---
Mayne, Wiley, <i>Iowa</i> -----	Rosenthal, Benjamin S., <i>N.Y.</i> -----	4801 Randolph Dr., Annandale, Va.
Meeds, Lloyd, <i>Wash</i> -----	Rostenkowski, Dan, <i>Ill</i> ---	Winn, Larry, Jr., <i>Kans</i> -----
Meskill, Thomas J., <i>Conn</i> ---	Roth, William V., Jr., <i>Del</i> ---	Wolff, Lester L., <i>N.Y.</i> -----
Michel, Robert H., <i>Ill</i> -----	Roudebush, Richard L., <i>Ind.</i> -----	Harbour Square Apartments, 500 N St. SW.
Miller, Clarence E., <i>Ohio</i> ---	Roush, J. Edward, <i>Ind</i> -----	Wright, Jim, <i>Tex</i> -----
Miller, George P., <i>Calif</i> ---	Royal, Edward R., <i>Calif</i> ---	Wyatt, Wendell, <i>Oreg</i> -----
Mills, Wilbur D., <i>Ark</i> -----	Rumsfeld, Donald, <i>Ill</i> -----	Wydler, John W., <i>N.Y.</i> ---
2701 Conn. Ave.	Ruppe, Philip E., <i>Mich</i> ---	Wylie, Chalmers P., <i>Ohio</i> ---
Minish, Joseph G., <i>N.J.</i> ---	Ryan, William F., <i>N.Y.</i> ---	Wyman, Louis C., <i>N.H.</i> ---
Mink, Patsy T., <i>Hawaii</i> ---	St Germain, Fernand J., <i>R.I.</i> -----	Yates, Sidney R., <i>Ill</i> -----
Minshall, William E., <i>Ohio</i> ---	St. Onge, William L., <i>Conn</i> ---	Young, John, <i>Tex</i> -----
8120 Kerry Lane, Chevy Chase, Md	Sandman, Charles W., Jr., <i>N.J.</i> -----	Zablocki, Clement J., <i>Wis</i> ---
MIze, Chester L., <i>Kans</i> -----	Satterfield, David E., III, <i>Va.</i> -----	Zion, Roger H., <i>Ind</i> -----
Monagan, John S., <i>Conn</i> ---	Saylor, John P., <i>Pa</i> -----	Zwach, John M., <i>Minn</i> ---
Montgomery, G. V. (Sonny), <i>Miss.</i> -----	Schadeberg, Henry C., <i>Wis</i> ---	RESIDENT COMMISSIONER
Moore, Arch A., Jr., <i>W. Va</i> ---	Scherle, William J., <i>Iowa</i> ---	Polanco-Abreu, Santiago, <i>P.R.</i> -----
Moorhead, William S., <i>Pa</i> ---	Scheuer, James H., <i>N.Y.</i> ---	OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE
Morgan, Thomas E., <i>Pa</i> ---	Schneebell, Herman T., <i>Pa</i> ---	Clerk—W. Pat Jennings.
Morris, Thomas G., <i>N. Mex</i> ---	Schwelker, Richard S., <i>Pa</i> ---	Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Morse, F. Bradford, <i>Mass</i> ---	Schwengel, Fred, <i>Iowa</i> ---	Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 3119 N. Har- rison St., Arlington 7, Va.
Morton, Rogers C. B., <i>Md</i> ---	Scott, William Lloyd, <i>Va</i> ---	Chaplain—Edward G. Latch.
Mosher, Charles A., <i>Ohio</i> ---	Selden, Armistead I., Jr., <i>Ala.</i> -----	Postmaster—H. H. Morris.
4246 Warren St.	Shipley, George E., <i>Ill</i> -----	OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES
Moss, John E., <i>Calif</i> -----	Shriver, Garner E., <i>Kans</i> ---	SENATE
Murphy, John M., <i>N.Y.</i> ---	Slkes, Robert L. F., <i>Fla</i> ---	Charles J. Drescher, Chief Reporter, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va. 22203
Murphy, William T., <i>Ill</i> -----	Slisk, B. F., <i>Calif</i> -----	Francis J. Attlg, 3919 Livingston St. 20015
Myers, John T., <i>Ind</i> -----	Skubitz, Joe, <i>Kans</i> -----	Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 216 Normandy Dr., Silver Spring, Md. 20900
Natcher, William H., <i>Ky</i> -----	Slack, John M., <i>W. Va</i> ---	Jack Romagna, 9908 Indian Lane, Silver Spring, Md. 20901
Nedzi, Lucien N., <i>Mich</i> ---	300 4th St. SW.	Francis J. McSwiggan, 7821 Friar's Court, Alexandria, Va. 22306
Nelsen, Anchor, <i>Minn</i> -----	Smith, H. Allen, <i>Calif</i> ---	G. Russell Walker, 8603 Preston St., Hyatts- ville, Md. 20784
Nichols, Bill, <i>Ala</i> -----	Smith, Henry P., III, <i>N.Y.</i> ---	Grant E. Perry, 7822 Elba Road, Alexandria, Va. 22306
Nix, Robert N. C., <i>Pa</i> -----	Smith, James V., <i>Okla</i> ---	William D. Mohr, 6 Cherbourg Court, Po- tomac, Md. 20854
O'Hara, Barratt, <i>Ill</i> -----	Smith, Neal, <i>Iowa</i> -----	Willard W. Pruett (assistant), 701 North Harrison St., Arlington, Va. 22205
The Congressional	Snyder, M. G. (Gene), <i>Ky</i> ---	Wilbur T. Smith (clerk), 9105 Southwick St., Fairfax, Va. 22203
O'Hara, James G., <i>Mich</i> ---	Springer, William L., <i>Ill</i> ---	Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Pl., Chillum, Md. 20780
O'Konski, Alvin E., <i>Wis</i> ---	Stafford, Robert T., <i>Vt</i> -----	HOUSE
Olsen, Arnold, <i>Mont</i> -----	Staggers, Harley O., <i>W. Va</i> ---	Frank E. Battaglia, LL. B., Chief Reporter, 957 East-West Highway.
4244 50th St.	Stanton, J. William, <i>Ohio</i> ---	Cleveland Tucker, 9412 Athens Rd., Burke, Va.
O'Neal, Maston, <i>Ga</i> -----	Steed, Tom, <i>Okla</i> -----	Jack Rund, 2389 N. Quincy St., Arlington, Va.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., <i>Mass.</i> -----	Steiger, Sam, <i>Ariz</i> -----	Jullan R. Series, Jr., 4225 North 31st St., Arlington, Va.
Ottlinger, Richard L., <i>N.Y.</i> ---	Stelger, William A., <i>Wis</i> ---	Joseph J. Sweeney, 101 G St. SW., Apt. A118.
Passman, Otto E., <i>La</i> -----	Stephens, Robert G., Jr., <i>Ga.</i> -----	Edna C. Moyer, 6310 Westridge Ct., Camp Springs, Md. 20031
Patman, Wright, <i>Tex</i> -----	Stratton, Samuel S., <i>N.Y.</i> ---	William L. Morse, 6538 Dearborn Dr., Falls Church, Va.
301 G St. SW.	Stubblefield, Frank A., <i>Ky</i> ---	B. J. Sigurdson (clerk), 1921 U Place SE.
Patten, Edward J., <i>N.J.</i> ---	Stuckey, Williamson S., <i>Ga.</i> -----	James W. Lea (assistant clerk), Prince Fred- erick, Calvert County, Md.
Pelly, Thomas M., <i>Wash</i> ---	Sullivan, Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.), <i>Mo.</i> -----	Edward White (assistant clerk), 2212 Iroquois La., Falls Church, Va.
Pepper, Claude, <i>Fla</i> -----	Taft, Robert, Jr., <i>Ohio</i> ---	
Perkins, Carl D., <i>Ky</i> -----	Talcott, Burt L., <i>Calif</i> ---	
Pettis, Jerry L., <i>Calif</i> ---	Taylor, Roy A., <i>N.C.</i> -----	
Phillbin, Phillip J., <i>Mass</i> ---	Teague, Charles M., <i>Calif</i> ---	
Pickle, J. J., <i>Tex</i> -----	Teague, Olin E., <i>Tex</i> -----	
Pike, Otis G., <i>N.Y.</i> -----	Tenzer, Herbert, <i>N.Y.</i> ---	
Pirnie, Alexander, <i>N.Y.</i> ---	Thompson, Frank, Jr., <i>N.J.</i> ---	
Poage, W. R., <i>Tex</i> -----	Thompson, S. Fletcher, <i>Ga</i> ---	
228 2d St. SE.	Thomson, Vernon W., <i>Wis</i> ---	
Podell, Bertram L., <i>N.Y.</i> ---	Tiernan, Robert O., <i>R.I.</i> ---	
Poff, Richard H., <i>Va</i> -----	Tuck, William M., <i>Va</i> -----	
Pollock, Howard W., <i>Alaska</i> ---	Tunney, John V., <i>Calif</i> ---	
Pool, Joe R., <i>Tex</i> -----		
Price, Melvin, <i>Ill</i> -----		
Price, Robert, <i>Tex</i> -----		
Pryor, David, <i>Ark</i> -----		
Pucinski, Roman C., <i>Ill</i> ---		
Purcell, Graham, <i>Tex</i> -----		
9026 Old Mt. Ver- non Rd., Alexandria, Va.		
Quie, Albert H., <i>Minn</i> -----		

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

House passed legislative branch appropriations bill.

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held Friday, June 28, at noon.

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee, in executive session, approved for full committee consideration with amendments H.R. 17023, fiscal 1969 appropriations for independent offices and the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

APPROPRIATIONS—D.C.

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee resumed hearings on fiscal 1969 budget estimates for the District of Columbia, with further testimony in behalf of funds for her department from Winifred G. Thompson, Director, Department of Public Welfare, D.C.

Hearings were continued in an evening session to receive testimony on funds for D.C. schools.

APPROPRIATIONS—JUSTICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee continued hearings on H.R. 17522, fiscal 1969 appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies, receiving testimony in behalf of funds for his department from Attorney General Ramsey Clark, who was accompanied by his associates.

Hearings were recessed subject to call.

APPROPRIATIONS—LEGISLATIVE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee concluded hearings on fiscal 1969 budget estimates for the legislative branch, after receiving testimony on funds for the Office of the Senate Sergeant at Arms.

Subcommittee will meet in executive session tomorrow to mark up this legislation.

APPROPRIATIONS—PUBLIC WORKS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee concluded hearings on civil functions section of H.R. 17903,

fiscal 1969 appropriations for public works, after receiving testimony from departmental witnesses on funds for the Corps of Army Engineers.

EAST-WEST TRADE

Committee on Banking and Currency: Subcommittee on International Finance resumed hearings on S.J. Res. 169, to promote an increase in trade in peaceful goods between the United States and nations of eastern Europe, having as its witnesses Lawrence C. McQuade, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Domestic and International Business; Isaiah Frank, school of advanced international studies, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore; Prof. Harold Berman, Harvard Law School; Randal Teague, Young Americans for Freedom, Washington, D.C.; and William B. Hicks, Liberty Lobby.

Hearings continue on Wednesday, July 17.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Committee on Commerce: Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported the following: S. 3514, authorizing the use of the vessel *Mouette* in the coastwise trade; S. 3566, to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 with respect to the definition of the term "supplemental air transportation" (amended); H.R. 3400, to amend the Federal Aviation Act so as to authorize aircraft noise abatement regulation (amended); S. 3641, authorizing Federal financial assistance in the development and construction of airports (amended); S. 1599, to protect the consumer by enabling him, under certain conditions, to rescind the retail sale of goods which is entered into at a place other than the address of the seller (amended); H.R. 13781, authorizing funds for sea-grant colleges and ocean exploration (amended); and H.R. 3136, to authorize a study to determine advantages and disadvantages of increased use of the metric system in the U.S. (amended).

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION

Committee on Commerce: Subcommittee on Surface Transportation approved for full committee consideration S. 751, authorizing ICC to require establishment of through routes and joint rates between motor carriers and between motor carriers and other common carriers (amended); S. 1175, extending time period for the

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued July 10, 1968
For actions of July 9, 1968
90th-2nd; No. 117

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....11	Hunger.....21	Taxation.....9,18,27
CCC.....2	Lands.....17	Tobacco.....33
Coffee.....5	Legislative program....16	Trade.....12
Credit unions.....32	Military construction...2	Trade fairs.....4
Crop insurance.....24	Opinion poll.....19	Travel.....28
Dairy indemnity.....16	Personnel.....28	Water.....31
Egg marketing.....6	Pollution.....22	Wilderness.....3
Expenditures.....9,18	Recreation.....15	Wildlife.....13
Federal aid.....7,26	River basins.....29	World trade.....25
Grains.....10	School lunches.....14	Youth Corps.....30
Holidays.....8	Small business.....23	
Housing.....1	Statistics.....20	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee reported grain inspection bill. Senate debated question of committee jurisdiction on school lunch bill. House debated housing bill. House subcommittee tabled egg marketing bill. House subcommittee approved wilderness bills. House committee voted to report bill to implement International Coffee Agreement.

HOUSE

1. HOUSING. Continued debate on H. R. 17989, to assist in the provision of housing for low- and moderate-income families, and to extend and amend laws relating to housing and urban development. pp. H6118-168
2. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. Received the conference report on H. R. 16703, the military construction authorization bill which includes CCC debt payment for prior years military family housing overseas (H. Rept. 1658). pp. H6168-79

3. WILDERNESS. A subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee approved for full committee action H. R. 16771, amended, to designate certain lands in the Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge, N. J., as wilderness; and H. R. 13512, to designate the Mount Jefferson Wilderness, Willamette, Deschutes, and Mount Hood National Forest, Oreg. p. D651
4. TRADE FAIRS. A subcommittee of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee approved for full committee action H. R. 18340, to provide for the continuation of authority to develop American flag carriers and promote the foreign commerce of the United States through the use of mobile trade fairs. p. D651
5. COFFEE. The Ways and Means Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 18299, amended, to carry out the obligations of the U. S. under the International Coffee Agreement, 1968 (p. D652). The committee was given until Thurs., midnight, July 11, to file a report (pp. H6117-18).
6. EGGS. A subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee tabled H. R. 15537, the table egg marketing bill. p. D651
7. FEDERAL AID. Rep. Roth emphasized the "immediate need" for legislation to create a catalog of Federal assistance programs and inserted supporting material. pp. H6184-5
N.Y.
8. HOLIDAYS. Rep. Rooney/expressed gratification that Columbus Day was included in the "weekend holiday" legislation. pp. H6185-6
9. TAXATION; EXPENDITURES. Rep. Hall criticized passage of the Revenue-Expenditure Control Act and inserted an article from Newsweek magazine stating "why this tax bill is the 'wrong medicine' for what ails our country." pp. H6186-87

SENATE

10. GRAINS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendments H. R. 15794, to provide for U. S. standards and a national inspection system for grain (S. Rept. 1351). p. S8296
11. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed with amendments H. R. 18038, the legislative branch appropriation bill, 1969 (pp. S8316-23). Conferees were appointed (p. S8323). House conferees have not been appointed.
The Appropriations Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) with amendments H. R. 17023, independent offices and HUD appropriation bill, 1969. p. D649
A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee approved for full committee consideration "those sections of the public works appropriations (H. R. 17903) which provide funds for the Atomic Energy Commission and the Tennessee Valley Authority." p. D649
12. TRADE. Began consideration of S. 3065, to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, by providing for temporary injunctions or restraining orders for certain violations of that act. p. S8333

July 10, 1968

10. ELECTRIFICATION; RECREATION. Reps. Goodling and Eshleman commended the Holtwood hydroelectric project on the Susquehanna River in Pa. as a great recreational potential. pp. H6307-8
11. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Kleppe inserted a copy of his letter to House Members commending the farm bill and urging their "thoughtful consideration." p. H6308
12. FOREIGN AID. Rep. Gonzalez spoke in support of the President's foreign aid program. p. H6308
Rep. Matsunaga stated in considering the foreign aid bill the House should consider "the impact of the foreign aid program upon the peoples of developing nations" and inserted an article, "Still Much To Be Done in Agriculture Aid." pp. H6316-18

SENATE

13. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments July 9, during adjournment, H. R. 17023, the independent offices and HUD appropriation bill (S. Rept. 1375). p. S8342
A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee approved for full committee consideration H. R. 18188, the Department of Transportation appropriation bill. p. D657
14. LANDS. Passed without amendment H. R. 16065, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release certain conditions in deeds conveying lands to Iowa (p. S8391). This bill will now be sent to the President.
The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendments S. 1385, relating to the disposition by the Secretary of the Interior of moneys obtained from the sale of materials from public lands (S. Rept. 1376). p. S8342
The Agriculture and Forestry Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) the following bills: S. 3578, to authorize release of a condition in a deed conveying certain lands to S. C. (amended); S. 3687, to authorize release of a condition in a deed conveying certain lands to Ohio; and S. 3736, to authorize the sale to Central, N. Mex., of certain lands which were formerly part of the Fort Bayard Military Reservation. p. D656
Sen. Jackson announced a hearing on legislation dealing with Alaska native land claims will be held before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on Fri., July 12, in Room 3110, New Senate Office Building. p. S8346
15. WILDERNESS. Passed as reported S. 3502, to designate certain lands in the Seney, Huron Islands, and Michigan Islands National Wildlife Refuges in Michigan, the Gravel Island and Green Bay National Wildlife Refuges in Wisconsin, and the Moosehorn National Wildlife Refuge in Maine, as wilderness. pp. S8340-1
Passed as reported S. 3425, to designate certain lands in the Monomoy National Wildlife Refuge Barnstable County, Mass., as wilderness. pp. S8339-40
Passed as reported S. 3379, to designate certain lands in the Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge, Morris County, N. J., as wilderness. p. S8339
Passed as reported S. 3343, to designate certain lands in the Pelican Island National Wildlife Refuge, Indian River County, Fla., as wilderness. pp. S8338-9

16. RECREATION. Passed without amendment H. R. 4739, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant long term leases with respect to lands in the El Portal administrative site adjacent to Yosemite National Park, Calif. p. S8340
17. LOANS. Passed without amendment H. R. 15562, to continue for 2 years, through June 30, 1970, the Farmers Home Administration's authority to make loans to lessee-operators of farmland in the State of Hawaii (p. S8341). This bill will now be sent to the President.
18. DAIRY. Passed without amendment S. 3638, to extend for three years the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make indemnity payments to dairy farmers for milk required to be withheld from commercial markets because it contains residues of chemicals registered and approved for use by the Federal Government. p. S8338
19. ELECTRIFICATION. Passed as reported S. 2445, to amend the Federal Power Act to clarify the licensing authority of the Commission and the right of the U. S. to take over a project or projects upon or after the expiration of any license shall be exercised. pp. S8389-90
20. TRANSPORTATION. Concurred in House amendments to S. 3102, to postpone for two years the date on which passenger vessels operating solely on the inland rivers and waterways must comply with certain safety standards (pp. S8388-9). This bill will now be sent to the President.
21. NOMINATION. Confirmed the nomination of James H. McCrocklin to be Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. pp. S8337, S8404
22. FARM PROGRAM. The Daily Digest states that the "Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, in executive session, by a vote of 10 to 5, ordered reported without amendments S. 3590, extending and improving programs to maintain farm income, stabilize prices, and assure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities. As approved by the committee the bill would provide a four-year extension of the present farm program, including the class-I milk base program. Committee agreed to strike the title of the bill relative to farm bargaining." p. D656
Sen. Long, Mo., expressed hope that the Senate will act this year on this bill to "benefit all farmers in Missouri and across the Nation." pp. S8372-3
23. WATERSHEDS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee approved plans for works of improvement on several watershed projects. p. D656
24. MANPOWER. The Labor and Public Welfare Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 2938, to extend certain expiring provisions under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended. p. D657
25. HUNGER. The Labor and Public Welfare Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. Res. 281, to establish a Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs. p. D657

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING
AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL,
1969

JULY 9, 1968.—Ordered to be printed

Filed under authority of the order of the Senate of March 16, 1968

Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Appropriations,
submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 17023]

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 17023) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, reports the same to the Senate with various amendments and presents herewith information relative to the changes made.

The report reflects the new budget concept and presents the effects of the committee's recommendations in terms of new budget (obligational) authority, which includes appropriations, authorizations to spend public debt receipts, and contract authorizations, less appropriations to liquidate contract authorizations.

Amounts in new budget (obligational) authority

Amount of bill as passed House.....	¹ \$13, 670, 636, 000
Amount of increase by Senate.....	1, 875, 916, 000
Amount of bill as reported to Senate.....	¹ 15, 546, 552, 000
Amount of appropriations, 1968.....	18, 056, 953, 950
Amount of budget estimates, 1969 (as amended) ..	18, 353, 717, 300
Under the estimates for 1969 (as amended) ..	2, 807, 165, 300
Under the appropriations for 1968.....	2, 510, 401, 950

¹ Excludes sums to liquidate contract authority (\$122,000,000). Includes advance funding for urban renewal programs (\$1,300,000,000).

GENERAL STATEMENT

The bill provides a total amount of \$15,546,552,000, which is \$2,510,401,950 under the appropriations for 1968, \$2,807,165,300

under the amended estimates for 1969, and an increase of \$1,875,-916,000 over the House bill.

The committee recommendations are based upon the estimates considered by the House, in House Document 225, and amendments contained in House Document 318 and Senate Document 80.

AUTHORIZATIONS

Since the House passed the bill, authorizations have been finalized, as follows:

For the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the House accepted the Senate amendments to H.R. 15856 on June 18, 1968, and Public Law 90-373 was approved on July 3, 1968.

For civil defense, H.R. 15504, concerning State and local civil defense personnel administrative expenses; procurement, maintenance, and donations to States of radiological equipment; and matching costs for travel and per diem of trainees at civil defense schools, was passed by the Senate on May 29, 1968, and Public Law 90-336 was approved on June 10, 1968.

For the Department of Housing and Urban Development, S. 3497 passed the Senate on May 28, 1968. H.R. 17989 was reported by the House on June 25, 1968.

The programs requiring authorization, for which the same amounts are provided in the Senate and House bills, are as follows:

Urban renewal programs for 1970.....	\$1, 400, 000, 000
Urban planning grants.....	35, 000, 000
Urban renewal programs in model cities areas for 1969.....	350, 000, 000
Urban information and technical assistance.....	10, 300, 000

The following table summarizes the agency, commission, and department budget estimates and the amount recommended. The tabulation by items of appropriations is included at the end of the report.

Summary of estimates and new budget (obligational) authority

Agency or item	Budget estimates	Recommended in House bill	Senate recommendation
National Aeronautics and Space Council.....	\$524, 000	\$500, 000	\$500, 000
Office of Emergency Planning.....	10, 164, 000	9, 625, 000	9, 625, 000
Office of Science and Technology.....	2, 485, 000	1, 750, 000	1, 850, 000
Appalachian regional development programs.....	213, 600, 000	168, 600, 000	178, 600, 000
Disaster relief.....	15, 000, 000	5, 000, 000	15, 000, 000
Appalachian Regional Commission.....	879, 000	850, 000	850, 000
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	9, 700, 000	9, 350, 000	9, 350, 000
Civil Service Commission.....	153, 455, 000	151, 098, 000	151, 662, 000
Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries.....	100, 000		100, 000
Commission on Mortgage Credit and Interest Rates.....	775, 000		
Federal Communications Commission.....	21, 271, 000	19, 750, 000	20, 000, 000
Federal Home Loan Bank Board.....	¹ (19, 484, 000)	¹ (19, 396, 000)	¹ (19, 396, 000)
Federal Power Commission.....	16, 060, 000	15, 000, 000	15, 200, 000
Federal Trade Commission.....	16, 127, 000	16, 000, 000	16, 000, 000
General Services Administration.....	509, 291, 300	494, 813, 000	499, 695, 000
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	23, 995, 000	23, 846, 000	23, 846, 000
National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	4, 370, 400, 000	4, 008, 223, 000	4, 008, 223, 000
National Science Foundation.....	500, 000, 000	400, 000, 000	410, 000, 000
Renegotiation Board.....	3, 080, 000	3, 000, 000	3, 080, 000
Securities and Exchange Commission.....	17, 903, 000	17, 730, 000	17, 830, 000
Selective Service System.....	63, 568, 000	63, 568, 000	63, 568, 000
Veterans' Administration.....	7, 528, 480, 000	6, 974, 207, 000	6, 977, 207, 000
Civil Defense (DOD).....	76, 800, 000	58, 040, 000	63, 640, 000
Civil Defense (HEW).....	2, 400, 000		
Department of Housing and Urban Development.....	4, 797, 660, 000	1, 229, 686, 000	3, 060, 726, 000
Total.....	18, 353, 717, 300	13, 670, 636, 000	15, 546, 552, 000

¹ Corporate funds available for administrative and nonadministrative expenses—no appropriation required.

PARTICIPATION CERTIFICATE SALES

The committee concurs in the action of the House to provide \$25 million in appropriation instead of the sale of participation certificates for the Housing for the Elderly or Handicapped Fund, where it is needed for 1969 programs.

The committee further concurs in the House action to deny additional authorizations for 1969 on other programs that do not require the funding, which effects a net reduction in new budget (obligational) authority of \$2,085 million which includes \$515 million for the Veterans' Administration and \$1,570 million for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

FEES AND CHARGES

The committee joins with the House committee in its concern that the Federal Government is not receiving sufficient return for all the services which it renders to special beneficiaries, and in its recommendation that the applicable agencies review their schedule of fees and charges with a view to making increases or adjustments as may be warranted, taking into consideration beneficial certificates and privileges granted, to offset in part the increasing needs for direct appropriations for operating costs of the agencies concerned.

REGULATORY PROCEDURES

The committee urges all of the regulatory bodies for which funds are provided herein to maintain a continuing study and upgrading of their procedures, in order to perfect and speed up their processes to the fullest extent practicable within the confines of the Administrative Procedures Act.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1968 appropriation-----	\$524, 000
Estimate, 1969-----	524, 000
House allowance-----	500, 000
Committee recommendation-----	500, 000

The committee concurs in the House allowance of \$500,000 for the Council, which is \$24,000 below the budget estimate.

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1968 appropriation-----	\$4, 700, 000
Estimate, 1969-----	5, 043, 000
House allowance-----	4, 850, 000
Committee recommendation-----	4, 850, 000

The committee concurs in the House allowance of \$4,850,000 for salaries and expenses of the Office of Emergency Planning, which is \$193,000 below the budget estimate.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1968 appropriation.....	\$1, 945, 000
Estimate, 1969.....	1, 986, 000
House allowance.....	1, 675, 000
Committee recommendation.....	1, 675, 000

The committee concurs in the House allowance of \$1,675,000 for the Office of Telecommunications, which is \$311,000 below the budget estimate.

CIVIL DEFENSE AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION FUNCTIONS OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

The committee concurs with the House allowance of \$3,100,000, which is \$35,000 below the budget estimate.

DISASTER RELIEF

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

1968 appropriation.....	\$20, 000, 000
Estimate, 1969.....	15, 000, 000
House allowance.....	5, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	15, 000, 000

Restoration of \$10,000,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide the full amount of the budget estimate of \$15,000,000. The committee is advised that allocations for new disasters in recent months have exceeded \$12,000,000, and that the full budget estimate is required in order to leave a working balance of \$7,500,000 in the fund.

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1968 appropriation.....	\$1, 550, 000
Estimate, 1969.....	1, 985, 000
House allowance.....	1, 750, 000
Committee recommendation.....	1, 850, 000

Restoration of \$100,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount for salaries and expenses of the Office of Science and Technology of \$1,850,000, which is \$135,000 below the budget estimate. Within the funds available the committee understands that a limited effort will be made which will contribute to an energy policy study.

The committee concurs in the denial by the House at this time of the separate item of \$500,000 requested for the energy study.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

1968 appropriation.....	\$126, 700, 000
Estimate, 1969.....	213, 600, 000
House allowance.....	168, 600, 000
Committee recommendation.....	178, 600, 000

Restoration of \$10 million is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of \$178,600,000 for Appalachian regional development programs, which is \$35 million below the budget estimate. The committee feels that greater emphasis should be placed on health and other high priority programs, instead of concentrating on highway development.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1968 appropriation.....	\$9, 082, 000
Estimate, 1969.....	9, 700, 000
House allowance.....	9, 350, 000
Committee recommendation.....	9, 350, 000

The committee concurs in the House allowance of \$9,350,000 for salaries and expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board, which is \$350,000 below the budget estimate.

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS

APPROPRIATION TO LIQUIDATE CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION

1968 appropriation.....	\$52, 500, 000
Estimate, 1969.....	47, 600, 000
House allowance.....	45, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	45, 000, 000

The committee concurs in the House allowance of \$45 million for payments to air carriers which is \$2,600,000 below the budget estimate.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1968 appropriation.....	\$36, 910, 000
Estimate, 1969 (plus transfer of \$6,460,000).....	39, 309, 000
House allowance (plus transfer of \$6,460,000).....	37, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	37, 564, 000

Restoration of \$564,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of \$37,564,000 for salaries and expenses of the Civil Service Commission, which is \$1,745,000 below the budget estimate. The committee understands that assistance to returning veterans, for which a large part of the restoration is requested, will be economically coordinated with the similar program of the Veterans' Administration to avoid duplication in funds or services.

COMMISSION ON EXECUTIVE, LEGISLATIVE, AND JUDICIAL SALARIES

The committee recommends adding a new item in the amount of \$100,000, as requested by the budget amendment in House Document No. 318, to provide for the fiscal year 1969 expenses of the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries, created by the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967 (Public Law 90-206), section 225.

The Commission is to undertake a review of the rates of pay in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Federal Government during the fiscal year 1969 and every fourth fiscal year thereafter.

The nine members of the Commission have been appointed from public life, three by the President of the United States, two by the President of the Senate, two by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and two by the Chief Justice of the United States. The Commission serves during the 1969 fiscal year and reports thereafter to the President of the United States with recommendations. New appointees are to be named for every fourth fiscal year.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1968 appropriation.....	\$19, 170, 000
Estimate, 1969.....	21, 271, 000
House allowance.....	19, 750, 000
Committee recommendation.....	20, 000, 000

Restoration of \$250,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of \$20 million for salaries and expenses of the Federal Communications Commission, which is \$1,271,000 below the budget estimate.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

1968 limitation.....	(\$4, 590, 000)
Estimate, 1969.....	(5, 088, 000)
House allowance.....	(5, 000, 000)
Committee recommendation.....	(5, 000, 000)

The committee concurs in the House allowance of \$5 million for administrative expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, which is \$88,000 below the budget estimate.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1968 appropriation.....	\$14, 660, 000
Estimate, 1969.....	16, 060, 000
House allowance.....	15, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	15, 200, 000

Restoration of \$200,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of \$15,200,000 for salaries and expenses of the Federal Power Commission, which is \$860,000 below the budget estimate. The restoration is intended to provide staff capability in the area of electric power reliability in cooperation with the utilities.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1968 appropriation.....	\$15, 281, 000
Estimate, 1969.....	16, 127, 000
House allowance.....	16, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	16, 000, 000

The committee concurs in the House allowance of \$16 million for salaries and expenses of the Federal Trade Commission, which is \$127,000 below the budget estimate.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE

OPERATING EXPENSES

1968 appropriation.....	\$262, 715, 000
Estimate, 1969.....	278, 763, 000
House allowance.....	271, 881, 000
Committee recommendation.....	276, 763, 000

Restoration of \$4,882,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of \$276,763,000 for operating expenses of the Public Buildings Service, which is \$2 million below the budget estimate.

CONSTRUCTION, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

No request for new obligational authority was made under this head for 1969, and no new public buildings construction projects are funded, consistent with current fiscal policy to minimize and defer commitments and expenditures wherever possible.

From funds previously appropriated, GSA plans the following obligation program for 1969.

PROJECTS IN 1969 OBLIGATION PROGRAM, 1969 BUDGET

	Scheduled for award	Improvement cost
Indiana, Hammond, PO CT (C. & R.).....	July 1968.....	\$909, 000
Massachusetts, Springfield, PO FOB.....		¹ 3, 724, 500
Nebraska, Lincoln, PO.....	July 1968.....	3, 271, 400
New York, Buffalo, FOB.....	do.....	13, 119, 300
Oregon, Baker, PO FOB.....	do.....	1, 450, 800
Tennessee, Oak Ridge, FOB.....	do.....	4, 435, 000
Reservations and contingencies.....	do.....	9, 490, 000
Total 1969 program.....		36, 400, 000

¹ Awarded Feb. 19, 1968.

In this connection, it is worthy of note that from 1959 through 1968 funds totaling \$1,334,511,000 have been made available for construction under this appropriation. The following tabulation shows the status of the funded program as of December 31, 1967:

	Number	Construction cost
Projects fully funded through fiscal year 1968:		
1. Completed or occupied.....	324	\$769, 775, 393
2. Buildings purchased.....	29	41, 931, 635
3. Under contract as of Dec. 31, 1967.....	45	299, 068, 816
4. To be placed under contract fiscal year 1969.....	6	27, 193, 600
5. To be placed under contract after fiscal year 1969.....	48	196, 541, 580
Total fully funded.....	452	1, 334, 511, 024

SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

The committee concurs with the House allowance of the full amount of the budget estimate of \$10,995,000 for sites and expenses of public buildings projects. The following tabulation lists the projects to be funded:

PROJECTS PROPOSED FOR SITES AND EXPENSES FUNDING, EXCLUDING CONSTRUCTION SUPERVISION FOR 1969

Project	Approved by Public Works Committees	Sites and expenses		Improvements		Total
		Available	In 1969 request	Available	Required after 1969	
Arizona: Tucson, Federal office building.	October 1966		\$1,215,000		\$3,081,000	\$4,296,000
Connecticut: New Haven, post office and Federal office building:						
Original	September 1965	\$317,000				
Amended	December 1967		400,000		5,858,000	6,575,000
Maine: Waterville, post office and Federal office building:						
Original	October 1966	334,000				
Amended	December 1967		218,000		1,661,000	2,213,000
Massachusetts: Fitchburg, post office and Federal office building:						
Original	April 1965			\$1,268,000		
Amended	December 1967	471,000	81,000		1,424,000	3,224,000
Michigan: Detroit, National Oata Center (IRS):						
Original	July 1963					
Amended	December 1967	561,000		3,496,000		
Ohio:						
Akron, courthouse and Federal office building.			233,000		3,287,000	7,637,000
Dayton, courthouse and Federal office building.	September 1965		1,323,000		3,674,000	4,997,000
Puerto Rico: San Juan, warehouse and motor pool facility	do.		241,000		4,395,000	4,636,000
South Dakota, Rapid City, courthouse and Federal office building:	do.		60,000		875,000	935,000
Original	October 1966					
Amended	December 1967		590,000		2,460,000	3,050,000
Virginia: Roanoke, Federal office building.	October 1966		662,000		4,703,000	5,365,000
Washington, O.C.: Federal Triangle, Pennsylvania Ave. annex, and Grand Plaza parking facility.	do.		1,485,000		39,245,000	40,731,000
Preliminary planning, development, and administrative operations.			4,426,000			4,426,000
Total, 11 projects		1,683,000	10,995,000	4,764,000	70,663,000	88,105,000

The committee concurs in the House allowance for other GSA programs, as follows:

Appropriation	Estimate	House allowance	Difference
Expenses, U.S. court facilities.....	1,200,000	750,000	-450,000
Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service.....	76,534,000	72,500,000	-4,034,000
Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service.....	18,728,300	18,300,000	-428,000
Operating expenses, Transportation and Communications Service.....	6,510,000	6,150,000	-360,000
Operating expenses, Property Management and Disposal Service.....	30,500,000	28,500,000	-2,000,000
Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator.....	1,944,000	1,820,000	-124,000
Administrative operations fund (limitation).....	(14,165,300)	(13,700,000)	(-465,300)
Working capital fund.....	200,000		-200,000

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1968 appropriation.....	\$23,846,000
Estimate, 1969.....	23,995,000
House allowance.....	23,846,000
Committee recommendation.....	23,846,000

The committee concurs in the House allowance of \$23,846,000 for salaries and expenses of the Interstate Commerce Commission, which is \$149,000 below the budget estimate.

The committee recommends inserting in the item "of which \$150,000 shall be available for valuation of pipelines."

The committee urges the Commission to give first priority to the problem of railcar shortage and again, as in previous years, directs the Commission to provide sufficient inspector personnel to assure proper movement of cars, particularly at harvest time.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Authorizations have been enacted for the individual programs under "Research and development" and under "Construction of facilities," without an overall ceiling in the law. The sum total of the authorized programs under "Research and development" is \$3,370,300,000, and the sum total of the authorized programs under "Construction of facilities" is \$39,600,000. Added to the authorization for "Administrative operations" of \$603,173,000, the grand total of authorizations is \$4,013,073,000.

Appropriations are recommended in the total amount of \$4,008,223,000, in concurrence with the House allowance, which is \$362,177,000 below the budget estimate.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

1968 appropriation.....	\$3,925,000,000
Estimate, 1969.....	3,677,200,000
Authorization, 1969.....	3,370,300,000
House allowance.....	3,383,250,000
Committee recommendation.....	3,370,300,000

A reduction of \$12,950,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount for the programs authorized for "Research and development" of \$3,370,300,000, which is \$306,900,000 below the budget estimate.

The committee concurs in the House recommendation that only the most important and highest priority programs be funded at this time. It is essential to continue the momentum of the Apollo program

that has been reestablished. Also, the committee is convinced that without the development of a nuclear rocket engine it is not possible to project a viable space program based on advancement in propulsion capability, and deferral of such development will be very costly to the Nation in the long run.

For the NERVA program, being developed jointly by NASA and AEC, the NASA authorization is \$55 million and the AEC authorization is \$69 million. The committee recommends that an adequate funding level be provided to assure that a balanced program is maintained between the two agencies.

CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

1968 appropriation.....	\$35, 900, 000
Estimate, 1969.....	45, 000, 000
Authorization, 1969.....	39, 600, 000
House allowance.....	21, 800, 000
Committee recommendation.....	34, 750, 000

Restoration of \$12,950,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount for the programs authorized for "Construction of facilities" of \$34,750,000, which is \$10,250,000 below the budget estimate.

ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS

1968 appropriation.....	\$628, 000, 000
Estimate, 1969.....	648, 200, 000
Authorization, 1969.....	603, 173, 000
House allowance.....	603, 173, 000
Committee recommendation.....	603, 173, 000

The committee concurs in the House allowance of \$603,173,000 for "Administrative operations," the amount of the authorization, which is \$45,027,000 below the budget estimate.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1968 appropriation.....	\$495, 000, 000
Estimate, 1969.....	500, 000, 000
House allowance.....	400, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	410, 000, 000

Restoration of \$10 million is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of \$410 million for salaries and expenses of the National Science Foundation, which is \$90 million below the budget estimate. Total obligational authority available is \$461,000,000.

The committee also recommends adding authority for the purchase of one aircraft and provision for the maintenance and operation of four aircraft.

The committee recommends the deletion of the proviso denying funds to an individual who willfully refuses to obey a lawful regulation of his university or college, and recommends as a substitute the following:

That if an institution of higher education receiving funds hereunder determines after affording notice and opportunity for hearing to an individual attending, or employed by, such institution, that such individual has, after the date of enactment of this Act, willfully refused to obey a lawful regulation or order of such institution and that such refusal was of a

serious nature and contributed to the disruption of the administration of such institution, then the institution shall deny any further payment to, or for the benefit of, such individual.

The committee suggests that future budget presentations be broken down into line items of appropriations, in order to provide the committee with better information as to the varied programs of the Foundation than is gathered from an examination of one overall appropriation item.

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1968 appropriation-----	\$2, 651, 000
Estimate, 1969-----	3, 080, 000
House allowance-----	3, 000, 000
Committee recommendation-----	3, 080, 000

Restoration of \$80,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide the full amount of the budget estimate, which the committee believes is needed in view of their increased workload.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

1968 appropriation-----	\$17, 730, 000
Estimate, 1969-----	17, 903, 000
House allowance-----	17, 730, 000
Committee recommendation-----	17, 830, 000

Restoration of \$100,000 is recommended by the committee, to be used for institutional investment studies. The total amount provided is \$17,830,000, which is \$73,000 below the budget estimate.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

The committee concurs with the House allowance of the full amount of the budget estimate of \$63,568,000 for the Selective Service System.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH

1968 appropriation-----	\$45, 850, 000
Estimate, 1969-----	47, 953, 000
House allowance-----	45, 850, 000
Committee recommendation-----	46, 850, 000

Restoration of \$1 million is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of \$46,850,000 for medical and prosthetic research, which is \$1,103,000 below the budget estimate.

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

1968 appropriation-----	\$189, 221, 000
Estimate, 1969-----	198, 549, 000
House allowance-----	195, 000, 000
Committee recommendation-----	197, 000, 000

Restoration of \$2 million is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of \$197 million for general operating expenses, which is \$1,549,000 under the budget estimate.

The committee concurs in the House allowance of \$612 million for "Readjustment benefits," which is \$5,600,000 under the budget estimate; of \$14,200,000 for "Medical administration" and "Miscellaneous operating expenses," which is \$534,000 below the budget estimate; of \$7,926,000 for "Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities," which is \$15,412,000 under the budget estimate; and of \$9,505,000 for "Payment of participation sales insufficiencies," which is \$2,075,000 below the budget estimate.

The committee is concerned that reimbursement for medical services cannot be obtained when the veterans have insurance coverage and yet certify as being unable to pay, and urges the Administrator to endeavor to find a means by which this injustice to the Veterans' Administration can be corrected.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

CIVIL DEFENSE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

1968 appropriation.....	\$66, 100, 000
Estimate, 1969.....	55, 200, 000
House allowance.....	48, 040, 000
Committee recommendation.....	48, 640, 000

Restoration of \$600,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of \$48,640,000 for civil defense operation and maintenance, which is \$6,560,000 below the budget estimate.

The committee further recommends that the limitation on the amount available for allocation to States on matching grants for personnel and administrative expenses be increased from \$18,500,000 to \$19,100,000. The extension of the authorization was enacted on June 10, 1968.

RESEARCH, SHELTER, SURVEY AND MARKING

1968 appropriation.....	\$20, 000, 000
Estimate, 1969.....	21, 600, 000
House allowance.....	10, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	15, 000, 000

Restoration of \$5 million is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of \$15 million for research, shelter, survey, and marking, which is \$6,600,000 below the budget estimate.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

EMERGENCY HEALTH ACTIVITIES

1968 appropriation.....	\$9, 000, 000
Estimate, 1969.....	2, 400, 000
House allowance.....	0
Committee recommendation.....	0

The committee concurs in the House denial of funds for emergency health activities, estimated at \$2,400,000, in view of the unobligated balance available.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

The committee recommends that the items for the Department of Housing and Urban Development be contained in title II of the bill, the items for corporations be contained in title III of the bill, and general provisions be contained in title IV of the bill.

URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAMS

1969 programs appropriated in 1968-----	\$750, 000, 000
Plus model cities add-on-----	500, 000, 000
Total-----	1, 250, 000, 000
Estimate for 1970 programs, pending authorization-----	1, 400, 000, 000
House deferred, pending authorization-----	0
Committee recommendation-----	1, 300, 000, 000

For advance funding on urban renewal programs for 1970, the committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,300 million. This is a reduction of \$100 million from the budget request of \$1,400 million, and will insure continuity of the programs.

URBAN PLANNING GRANTS

1968 appropriation-----	\$45, 000, 000
Estimate, 1969:	
Authorized-----	38, 838, 000
Pending authorization-----	16, 162, 000
House allowance-----	38, 838, 000
Committee recommendation-----	38, 838, 000

The committee concurs with the House allowance of \$38,838,000 for urban planning grants, which is \$16,162,000 below the budget estimate, based on the pending authorization.

GRANTS FOR BASIC WATER AND SEWER FACILITIES

1968 appropriation-----	\$165, 000, 000
Estimate, 1969-----	150, 000, 000
House allowance-----	150, 000, 000
Committee recommendation-----	165, 000, 000

An increase over the budget estimate of \$15 million is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of \$165 million for grants for basic water and sewer facilities, the same amount appropriated for 1968.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION

The committee is concerned with duplication of effort and with the full implementation of Reorganization Plan No. 2 as proposed by the President and as understood and approved by the Congress, and directs the Department of Housing and Urban Development to insure, within the intent of the reorganization plan, that such projects and functions be transferred to the Department of Transportation as soon as practicable.

MODEL CITIES PROGRAMS

1968 appropriation:	
Planning grants-----	\$12, 000, 000
Supplemental grants-----	200, 000, 000
Urban renewal-----	100, 000, 000
Total-----	<u>312, 000, 000</u>
Estimate, 1969:	
Supplemental grants-----	500, 000, 000
Urban renewal:	
Authorized-----	150, 000, 000
Pending authorization-----	350, 000, 000
Total-----	<u>1, 000, 000, 000</u>
House allowance:	
Initial cities-----	200, 000, 000
Second round-----	200, 000, 000
Urban renewal-----	100, 000, 000
Total-----	<u>500, 000, 000</u>
Committee recommendation:	
Supplemental grants-----	500, 000, 000
Urban renewal-----	500, 000, 000
Total-----	<u>1, 000, 000, 000</u>

Restoration of \$400 million is recommended by the committee for grants for urban renewal projects within approved city demonstration programs, to provide the full amount of the budget estimate of \$500 million based upon the pending authorization.

For the appropriation, the committee recommends restoration of \$500 million, to provide the full amount of the budget estimate of \$1 billion based upon the pending authorization. This would provide the \$500 million to be transferred to urban renewal programs and \$500 million estimated for supplemental grants.

URBAN INFORMATION AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

1968 appropriation-----	\$2, 200, 000
Estimate, 1969, pending authorization-----	5, 000, 000
House allowance-----	0
Committee recommendation-----	2, 500, 000

The committee recommends inserting a new item, in the amount of \$2,500,000 for urban information and technical assistance, which is \$2,500,000 below the budget estimate based upon pending authorization. The program is for matching grants to States to establish programs for small communities under 100,000 population.

DEMONSTRATION AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

	<i>Appropriation</i>	<i>Transfer</i>
1968 appropriation.....	\$1, 891, 300	(\$2, 500, 000)
Estimate, 1969.....	1, 860, 000	(8, 380, 000)
House allowance.....	1, 860, 000	(6, 000, 000)
Committee recommendation.....	1, 400, 000	(6, 000, 000)

A reduction of \$460,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide a total appropriation of \$1,400,000 for "Salaries and expenses" under "Demonstration and Intergovernmental Relations."

The committee concurs with the House allowance of \$6 million to be transferred from the appropriation for model cities programs, which is \$2,380,000 below the budget estimate.

The committee recommends deletion of the portion of the proviso denying funds for the administration or implementation of section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966.

URBAN RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

1968 appropriation.....	\$10, 000, 000
Estimate, 1969.....	20, 000, 000
House allowance.....	10, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	15, 000, 000

Restoration of \$5 million is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of \$15 million for "Urban research and technology," which is \$5 million below the budget estimate.

The committee recommends the deletion of the proviso limiting the amount available for administrative expenses.

RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM

1968 authorization.....	(\$10, 000, 000)
Estimate, 1969.....	(65, 000, 000)
House allowance.....	(25, 000, 000)
Committee recommendation.....	(65, 000, 000)

Restoration of \$40 million is recommended by the committee, to provide the full amount of the budget estimate of \$65 million in contract authority for the rent supplement program in 1969. With this restoration a total amount of \$107 million has been authorized for

contracts out of the original authorization of \$150 million. The contract authority for 1969 is expected to provide 72,200 supplemental units, which are a vital part of the President's 10-year housing program.

Again, as stated in the report last year, the committee agrees that the Congress intended market rate mortgages in the rent supplement program to be financed in the private market in the usual conventional way, and expects the Secretary to be guided accordingly. In those cases where this is not possible, in every rent supplement project the sponsor shall be required to provide at least a 10 percent equity investment, except for nonprofit organizations 5 percent if assistance is sought under the special assistance program of FNMA.

The committee concurs in the House allowances for other HUD programs, as follows:

Appropriation	Estimate	House allowance	Difference
Grants for neighborhood facilities.....	\$40,000,000	\$35,000,000	-\$5,000,000
Salaries and expenses, RHA.....	36,360,000	34,000,000	-2,360,000
Open space land programs.....	(85,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(-10,000,000)
Salaries and expenses, MD.....	8,700,000	7,000,000	-1,700,000
Community development training.....	7,000,000	3,000,000	-4,000,000
Low-income housing, liquidate.....	(4,496,000)	(2,000,000)	(-2,496,000)
Rent supplement, payments.....	15,000,000	12,000,000	-3,000,000
General administration.....	8,000,000	6,000,000	-2,000,000
Regional management, services.....	8,925,000	6,500,000	-2,425,000
Working capital fund.....	2,000,000	0	-2,000,000
Payment of insufficiencies, PS.....	57,615,000	47,638,000	-9,977,000

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

1968 limitation.....	(\$11,000,000)
Estimate, 1969.....	(11,950,000)
House allowance.....	(11,500,000)
Committee recommendation.....	(11,675,000)

NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

1968 limitation.....	(\$87,000,000)
Estimate, 1969.....	(95,600,000)
House allowance.....	(92,000,000)
Committee recommendation.....	(94,000,000)

For administrative expenses, the committee recommends restoration of \$175,000, to provide a total amount of \$11,675,000, which is \$275,000 below the budget estimate.

For nonadministrative expenses, the committee recommends restoration of \$2 million, to provide a total amount of \$94 million which is \$1,600,000 below the budget estimate.

COMMISSION ON MORTGAGE CREDIT AND INTEREST RATES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The committee considered the budget amendment contained in Senate Document No. 80, requesting \$775,000 for salaries and expenses of the Commission on Mortgage Credit and Interest Rates, authorized by Public Law 90-301.

The committee denies funding for this Commission at this time.

FAIR HOUSING PROGRAM

The committee recommends adding a new item in the amount of \$9,000,000, which is \$2,100,000 below the request of \$11,100,000 submitted by budget amendment contained in Senate Document No. 80, for expenses necessary to carry out the functions of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development under the provisions of title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968.

The appropriation provides a direct staff for the Assistant Secretary for Equal Opportunity estimated at 140 in the central office and 710 in the regional offices, in addition to related supporting services.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SECTION 307

The committee recommends adding to the general provision denying funds to finance interdepartmental groups which do not have prior and specific congressional approval of such method of financial support, an exception to provide limited funds in 1969 for four agencies concerned.

SECTION 308 .

The committee recommends the deletion of "or any group activity" from the general provision prohibiting the payment of salaries to Federal employees convicted of offenses related to or part of riots and other civil disturbances.

The committee also recommends inserting "finally" before "convicted", to allow the full benefit of appeals procedures before the provision is effective.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1968 AND THE BUDGET
ESTIMATES FOR 1969**

PERMANENT NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY—FEDERAL FUNDS

[Becomes available automatically under earlier, or "permanent" law without further, or annual, action by the Congress. Thus, these amounts are *not* included in the accompanying bill

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority, 1968 (2)	Budget estimate of new (obligational) authority, 1969 (3)	Increase (+) or decrease (-) (4)
Civil Aeronautics Board: Payments to air carriers (contract authorization, indefinite)-----	\$53,061,000	\$53,211,000	+\$150,000
Federal Power Commission: Payments to States under Federal Power Act (indefinite)-----	99,000	99,000	-----
General Services Administration: Expenses, disposal of surplus real and related personal property (indefinite)-----	1,000,000	1,000,000	-----
Veterans' Administration: Veterans insurance and indemnities (indefinite)-----	650,000	650,000	-----
Department of Housing and Urban Development:			
<i>Urban renewal programs</i> -----	¹ (750,000,000)	¹ (750,000,000)	-----
College housing loan fund (authorization to spend public debt receipts)-----	300,000,000	300,000,000	-----
College housing loan fund (participation sales insufficiencies, indefinite)-----	10,739,000	12,061,000	+1,322,000
<i>Urban mass transportation grants</i> -----	¹ (125,000,000)	¹ (175,000,000)	1 (+50,000,000)
Public facility loans (participation sales insufficiencies, indefinite)-----	1,325,000	1,305,000	-20,000
Federal National Mortgage Association:			
Special assistance functions (authorization to spend public debt receipts)-----	550,000,000	525,000,000	-25,000,000
Management and liquidating functions (authorization to spend public debt receipts, indefinite)-----	82,708,000	-----	-82,708,000
Total permanent new budget (obligational) authority, Federal funds-----	999,582,000	893,326,000	-106,256,000

¹ New budget (obligational) authority becoming available under prior appropriation acts and excluded from totals.

NOTE.—Amounts as estimated and shown in the January 1968 budget document. Some items are indefinite in amount, and thus are subject to later reestimation.

PERMANENT NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY- TRUST FUNDS

Appalachian Regional Commission: Miscellaneous trust fund accounts.....	\$1,398,000	\$1,592,000	+\$194,000
Civil Service Commission: Civil service retirement and disability fund.....	3,440,100,000	3,626,500,000	+186,400,000
General Services Administration: National Archives gift fund.....	150,000	100,000	-50,000
National Aeronautics and Space Administration: Miscellaneous trust funds.....	2,688,000	1,548,000	-1,140,000
National Science Foundation: Donations.....	1,000	1,000	-----
Veterans' Administration:			
General post fund, national homes.....	1,820,000	1,790,000	-30,000
National service life insurance fund.....	702,160,000	699,043,000	-3,117,000
U.S. Government life insurance fund.....	49,810,000	44,725,000	-5,085,000
Department of Housing and Urban Development: Federal National Mortgage Association, secondary market operations.....	536,655,000	159,000,000	-377,655,000
Total permanent new budget (obligational) authority, trust funds.....	4,734,782,000	4,534,299,000	-200,483,000

TITLE III

ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

[Limitation on accounts of corporate funds to be expended]

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1968, (enacted to date) ¹	Budget esti- mates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill, fiscal year 1969	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill, fiscal year 1969	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriations, NOA, 1968	Budget esti- mates, NOA, 1969	House bill, NOA, 1969
<i>Federal Home Loan Bank Board:</i>							
Administrative expenses	(\$4,590,000)	(\$5,088,000)	(\$5,000,000)	(\$5,000,000)	(+\$410,000)	(-\$88,000)	-----
Nonadministrative expenses	(13,650,000)	(14,396,000)	(14,396,000)	(14,396,000)	(+\$746,000)	-----	-----
<i>Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation</i>	(298,000)	(340,000)	(340,000)	(340,000)	(+\$42,000)	-----	-----
<i>Department of Housing and Urban Development:</i>							
Housing for the elderly or handicapped	(1,272,000)	(1,292,000)	(1,272,000)	(1,272,000)	-----	(-10,000)	-----
College housing loans	(2,275,000)	(2,256,000)	(2,275,000)	(2,275,000)	-----	(-10,000)	-----
Public facility loans	(1,227,000)	(1,255,000)	(1,227,000)	(1,227,000)	-----	(-28,000)	-----
Revolving fund (liquidating programs)	(100,000)	(104,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	-----	(-4,000)	-----
<i>Federal Housing Administration:</i>							
Administrative expenses	(11,000,000)	(11,960,000)	(11,500,000)	(11,675,000)	(+\$675,000)	(-\$275,000)	(+\$175,000)
Nonadministrative expenses	(87,000,000)	(95,600,000)	(92,000,000)	(94,000,000)	(+\$7,000,000)	(-\$1,600,000)	(+\$2,000,000)
<i>Federal National Mortgage Association</i>	(9,800,000)	(10,340,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(+\$200,000)	(-\$340,000)	-----
<i>Total administrative expenses</i>	(131,212,000)	(142,690,000)	(133,110,000)	(140,285,000)	(+\$9,073,000)	(-\$2,335,000)	(+\$175,000)

¹ Amounts have not been reduced to reflect reserves established pursuant to Public Law 90-218. Proposed supplementals and interaccount transfers are excluded.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1968 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1969

[NOTE.—All amounts are in the form of "appropriations" unless otherwise indicated]

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1968 (enacted to date) 1	Budget esti- mates (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill, fiscal year 1969	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill, fiscal year 1969	Increase (+) or decrease (—), Senate bill compared with—	
					Appropriations, NOA, 1968	Budget esti- mates, NOA, 1969
TITLE I						
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT						
NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL						
Salaries and expenses-----	\$524, 000	\$524, 000	\$500, 000	\$500, 000	—\$24, 000	—\$24, 000
OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING						
Salaries and expenses-----	4, 700, 000	5, 043, 000	4, 850, 000	4, 850, 000	+150, 000	—193, 000
Salaries and expenses, telecommunications-----	1, 945, 000	1, 986, 000	1, 675, 000	1, 675, 000	—270, 000	—311, 000
Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies-----	3, 102, 000	3, 135, 000	3, 100, 000	3, 100, 000	—2, 000	—35, 000
Total, Office of Emergency Planning-----	9, 747, 000	10, 164, 000	9, 625, 000	9, 625, 000	—122, 000	—539, 000
OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY						
Salaries and expenses-----	1, 550, 000	1, 985, 000	1, 750, 000	1, 850, 000	+300, 000	—135, 000
Energy study-----		500, 000				—500, 000
Total, Office of Science and Technology-----	1, 550, 000	2, 485, 000	1, 750, 000	1, 850, 000	+300, 000	—635, 000
PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON POSTAL ORGANIZATION						
Salaries and expenses-----	1, 000, 000				—1, 000, 000	
Total, Executive Office of the President.-----	12, 821, 000	13, 173, 000	11, 875, 000	11, 975, 000	—846, 000	—1, 198, 000
						+100, 000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 27.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1968 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1969—Continued

[NOTE.—All amounts are in the form of "appropriations" unless otherwise indicated]

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1968, (enacted to date) ¹	Budget esti- mates (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill, fiscal year 1969	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill, fiscal year 1969	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriations, NOA, 1968	Budget esti- mates, NOA, 1969	House bill, NOA, 1969
TITLE I—Continued							
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT							
Appalachian regional development programs.....	\$126,700,000	\$213,600,000	\$168,600,000	\$178,600,000	+\$51,900,000	—\$35,000,000	+\$10,000,000
Disaster relief.....	20,000,000	15,000,000	5,000,000	15,000,000	—5,000,000	-----	+10,000,000
Total, funds appropriated to the President.....	146,700,000	228,600,000	173,600,000	193,600,000	+46,900,000	—35,000,000	+20,000,000
INDEPENDENT OFFICES							
APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION							
Salaries and expenses.....	² 745,750	879,000	850,000	850,000	+104,250	—29,000	-----
CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD							
Salary and expenses.....	9,082,000	9,700,000	9,350,000	9,350,000	+268,000	—350,000	-----
<i>Payments to air carriers (appropriation to liquidate contract authorization).....</i>	³ (52,500,000)	(47,600,000)	(45,000,000)	(45,000,000)	(—7,500,000)	(—2,600,000)	-----
Total, Civil Aeronautics Board.....	9,082,000	9,700,000	9,350,000	9,350,000	+268,000	—350,000	-----
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION							
Salaries and expenses:							
Appropriation.....	36,910,000	39,309,000	37,000,000	37,564,000	+654,000	—1,745,000	+564,000
<i>By transfer.....</i>	(6,100,000)	(6,460,000)	(6,460,000)	(6,460,000)	(+360,000)	-----	-----
Annuities under special acts.....	1,378,000	1,366,000	1,350,000	1,350,000	—28,000	—16,000	-----

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1968 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES
AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1969—Continued**

[NOTE.—All amounts are in the form of "appropriations" unless otherwise indicated]

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1968, (enacted to date) ¹	Budget esti- mates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill, fiscal year 1969	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill, fiscal year 1969	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriations, NOA, 1968	Budget esti- mates, NOA, 1969	House bill, NOA, 1969
TITLE I—Continued							
INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued							
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION—Continued							
Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service	\$17,887,000	\$18,728,300	\$18,300,000	\$18,300,000	+413,000	—\$428,300	
National historical publication grants	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000			
Operating expenses, Transportation and Communications Service	6,025,000	6,510,000	6,150,000	6,150,000	+125,000	—360,000	
Operating expenses, Property Management and Disposal Service	27,572,000	30,500,000	28,500,000	28,500,000	+928,000	—2,000,000	
Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator	1,793,000	1,944,000	1,820,000	1,820,000	+27,000	—124,000	
Allowances and office facilities for former Presidents	251,000	267,000	267,000	267,000	+16,000		
Expenses, Presidential transition		900,000	900,000	900,000	+900,000		
Administrative operations fund (limitation on administrative expenses)	(16,650,000)	(14,165,300)	(18,700,000)	(18,700,000)	(—2,950,000)	(—465,300)	
Working capital fund		200,000				—200,000	
Total, General Services Administration	566,581,900	509,291,300	494,813,000	499,695,000	—66,886,900	—9,596,300	+\$4,882,000
INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION							
Salaries and expenses	23,846,000	23,995,000	23,846,000	23,846,000		—149,000	
NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION							
Research and development	3,925,000,000	3,677,200,000	3,383,250,000	3,370,300,000	—554,700,000	—306,900,000	—12,950,000

Construction of facilities.....	35,900,000	45,000,000	21,800,000	34,750,000	-1,150,000	-10,250,000	+12,950,000
Administrative operations.....	628,000,000	648,200,000	603,173,000	603,173,000	-24,827,000	-45,027,000	-----
Total, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	4,588,900,000	4,370,400,000	4,008,223,000	4,008,223,000	-580,677,000	-362,177,000	-----
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION							
Salaries and expenses.....	495,000,000	500,000,000	400,000,000	410,000,000	-85,000,000	-90,000,000	+10,000,000
RENEGOTIATION BOARD							
Salaries and expenses.....	2,651,000	3,080,000	3,000,000	3,080,000	+429,000	-----	+80,000
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION							
Salaries and expenses.....	17,730,000	17,903,000	17,730,000	17,830,000	+100,000	-73,000	+100,000
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM							
Salaries and expenses.....	64,175,000	63,568,000	63,568,000	63,568,000	-607,000	-----	-----
VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION							
Compensation and pensions.....	4,605,500,000	4,654,336,000	4,654,336,000	4,654,336,000	+48,836,000	-----	-----
Readjustment benefits.....	427,200,000	617,600,000	612,000,000	612,000,000	+184,800,000	-5,600,000	-----
Veterans' insurance and indemnities.....	5,150,000	9,350,000	- 9,350,000	9,350,000	+4,200,000	-----	-----
Medical care.....	1,361,593,000	1,420,264,000	1,420,264,000	1,420,264,000	+58,671,000	-----	-----
Medical and prosthetic research.....	45,850,000	47,953,000	45,850,000	46,850,000	+1,000,000	-1,103,000	+1,000,000
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses.....	13,975,000	14,734,000	14,200,000	14,200,000	+225,000	-534,000	-----
General operating expenses.....	189,221,000	198,549,000	195,000,000	197,000,000	+7,779,000	-1,549,000	+2,000,000
Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities.....	52,600,000	33,338,000	7,926,000	7,926,000	-44,674,000	-25,412,000	-----
Grants for construction of State nursing homes.....	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	-----	-----	-----
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines.....	1,325,000	1,776,000	1,776,000	1,776,000	+451,000	-----	-----
Loan guarantee revolving fund (limitation on obligations).....	(386,046,000)	Language	(450,000,000)	(450,000,000)	(+63,954,000)	(+450,000,000)	-----
Participation sales authorization.....	850,000,000	515,000,000	-----	-----	-850,000,000	-515,000,000	-----
Payment of participation sales insufficiencies.....	665,000	\$ 11,580,000	9,505,000	9,505,000	+8,840,000	-2,075,000	-----
Total, Veterans' Administration.....	7,557,079,000	7,528,480,000	6,974,207,000	6,977,207,000	-579,872,000	-551,273,000	+3,000,000
Total, independent offices.....	13,524,962,650	13,235,084,300	12,197,435,000	12,216,611,000	-1,308,351,650	-1,018,473,300	+19,176,000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 27.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1968 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES
AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1969—Continued**

[NOTE.—All amounts are in the form of "appropriations" unless otherwise indicated]

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1968, (enacted to date) ¹	Budget esti- mates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill, fiscal year 1969	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill, fiscal year 1969	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriations, NOA, 1968	Budget esti- mates, NOA, 1969	House bill, NOA, 1969
TITLE I—Continued							
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE							
CIVIL DEFENSE							
Operation and maintenance.....	\$66,100,000	⁷ \$55,200,000	⁷ \$48,040,000	\$48,640,000	—\$17,460,000	—\$6,560,000	+ \$600,000
Research, shelter survey and marking.....	20,000,000	21,600,000	10,000,000	15,000,000	—5,000,000	—6,600,000	+5,000,000
Total, Civil Defense, Department of Defense.....	86,100,000	76,800,000	58,040,000	63,640,000	—22,460,000	—13,160,000	+5,600,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE							
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE							
Emergency health activities.....	9,000,000	2,400,000	-----	0	—9,000,000	—2,400,000	-----
Total, Title I.....	13,779,583,650	13,556,057,300	12,440,950,000	12,485,826,000	—1,293,757,650	—1,070,231,300	+44,876,000
TITLE II							
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT							
RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE							
Housing for the elderly or handicapped fund.....	⁸ 25,000,000	⁹ 25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	-----	-----	-----
Alaska housing.....	-----	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	+1,000,000	-----	-----
Grants for neighborhood facilities.....	30,000,000	40,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000	+5,000,000	—5,000,000	-----
Urban renewal programs, 1969.....	750,000,000	-----	-----	-----	—750,000,000	-----	-----
Urban renewal programs, 1970.....	-----	1,400,000,000	(¹⁰)	1,300,000,000	+1,300,000,000	—100,000,000	+1,300,000,000

Low-rent public housing annual contributions.....	295,000,000	358,000,000	350,000,000	+55,000,000	-8,000,000	-----
Salaries and expenses.....	32,803,600	36,360,000	34,000,000	+1,196,400	-2,360,000	-----
Total, renewal and housing assistance.....	1,132,803,600	1,860,360,000	445,000,000	+612,196,400	-115,360,000	+1,300,000,000
METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT						
Urban planning grants.....	45,000,000	55,000,000	38,838,000	-6,162,000	-16,162,000	-----
<i>Open space land programs (appropriation to liquidate contract authorization)</i>	(75,000,000)	(85,000,000)	(75,000,000)	-----	(-10,000,000)	-----
Grants for basic water and sewer facilities.....	165,000,000	150,000,000	165,000,000	-----	+15,000,000	+15,000,000
Salaries and expenses.....	6,289,200	8,700,000	7,000,000	+710,800	-1,700,000	-----
Urban mass transportation grants, 1969.....	175,000,000	12 15,000,000	0	-175,000,000	-15,000,000	-----
Total, metropolitan development.....	391,289,200	228,700,000	195,838,000	-180,451,200	-17,862,000	+15,000,000
DEMONSTRATIONS AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS						
Model cities programs.....	12 312,000,000	14 1,000,000,000	1,000,000,000	+688,000,000	-----	+500,000,000
Urban information and technical assistance.....	2,200,000	5,000,000	(15) 2,500,000	+300,000	-2,500,000	+2,500,000
Community development training programs.....	3,000,000	7,000,000	3,000,000	-----	-4,000,000	-----
Fellowships for city planning and urban studies.....	500,000	500,000	500,000	-----	-----	-----
Salaries and expenses:						
Appropriation.....	1,891,300	1,860,000	1,400,000	-491,300	-460,000	-460,000
By transfer.....	(2,580,000)	(3,380,000)	(6,000,000)	(+3,490,000)	(-2,380,000)	-----
Urban research and technology.....	10,000,000	20,000,000	15,000,000	+5,000,000	-5,000,000	+5,000,000
<i>Low-income housing demonstration programs (appropriation to liquidate contract authorization)</i>	(2,000,000)	(4,496,000)	(2,000,000)	-----	(-2,496,000)	-----
Total, demonstrations and intergovernmental relations.....	329,591,300	1,034,360,000	1,022,400,000	+692,808,700	-11,960,000	+507,040,000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 27.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1968 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES
AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1969—Continued**

[NOTE.—All amounts are in the form of "appropriations" unless otherwise indicated]

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1968, (enacted to date) ¹	Budget esti- mates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill, fiscal year 1969	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill, fiscal year 1969	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriations, NOA, 1968	Budget esti- mates, NOA, 1969	House bill, NOA, 1969
TITLE II—Continued							
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT—Continued							
MORTGAGE CREDIT							
Rent supplement program:							
<i>Increased limitation for annual contract authorization</i>	(\$10,000,000)	(\$65,000,000)	(\$25,000,000)	(\$65,000,000)	(+\$55,000,000)	-----	(+\$40,000,000)
Appropriation for payments.....	5,000,000	15,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	+7,000,000	-3,000,000	-----
Administrative expenses.....	1,100,000	1,600,000	1,350,000	1,350,000	+250,000	-250,000	-----
Total, mortgage credit.....	6,100,000	16,600,000	13,350,000	13,350,000	+7,250,000	-3,250,000	-----
DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT							
General administration.....	4,131,000	8,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	+1,869,000	-2,000,000	-----
Regional management and services.....	5,455,200	8,925,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	+1,044,800	-2,425,000	-----
Fair housing program.....	-----	11,100,000	-----	9,000,000	+9,000,000	-2,100,000	+9,000,000
Working capital fund.....	¹⁰ (1,500,000)	2,000,000	-----	0	(-1,500,000)	-2,000,000	-----
Total, departmental management.....	9,586,200	30,025,000	12,500,000	21,500,000	+11,913,800	-8,525,000	+9,000,000
PARTICIPATION SALES							
Participation sales authorization.....	2,385,000,000	17 1,570,000,000	-----	0	-2,385,000,000	-1,570,000,000	-----
Payment of participation sales insufficiencies.....	23,000,000	6 57,615,000	47,638,000	47,638,000	+24,638,000	-9,977,000	-----

Total, participation sales-----	2, 408, 000, 000	1, 627, 615, 000	47, 638, 000	47, 638, 000	-2, 360, 362, 000	-1, 579, 977, 000	-----
Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development—Title II-----	4, 277, 370, 300	4, 797, 660, 000	1, 229, 686, 000	3, 060, 726, 000	-1, 216, 644, 300	-1, 736, 934, 000	+1, 831, 040, 000
Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority-----	18, 056, 953, 950	18, 353, 717, 300	13, 670, 636, 000	15, 546, 552, 000	-2, 510, 401, 950	-2, 807, 165, 300	+1, 875, 916, 000
Consisting of—							
Appropriations							
Authorizations to spend agency debt receipts (participation certificates)-----							
VA-----	\$515, 000, 000						
HUD-----	\$1, 595, 000, 000						
2, 110, 000, 000							
Memoranda—							
Appropriations-----							
Appropriations to liquidate contract authorizations-----							
Payments to air carriers-----	\$45, 000, 000						
Open space land programs-----	75, 000, 000						
Low-income housing demonstration programs-----	2, 000, 000						
122, 000, 000							
Total appropriations-----							
	18 (14, 821, 953, 950)	(16, 243, 717, 300)	(13, 670, 636, 000)	(15, 546, 552, 000)	(+724, 598, 050)	(-697, 165, 300)	(+1, 875, 916, 000)
	(129, 500, 000)	(137, 096, 000)	(122, 000, 000)	(122, 000, 000)	(-7, 500, 000)	(-15, 096, 000)	-----
	18 (14, 951, 453, 950)	(16, 380, 813, 300)	(13, 792, 636, 000)	(15, 668, 552, 000)	(+717, 098, 050)	(-712, 261, 300)	(+1, 875, 916, 000)

¹ Includes amounts in 2d supplemental, 1968. Reserves under Public Law 90-218 are not reflected, and transfers or releases are excluded.

² Excludes \$11,000 reapportionment provided in Public Law 90-103 (Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1967).

³ Includes \$1,500,000 new budget (obligational) authority.

⁴ Budget amendment in H. Doc. 318.

⁵ Budget amendment in S. Doc. 80.

⁶ Estimated amount of indefinite appropriation.

⁷ Excludes \$500,000 transfer from civil defense procurement fund.

⁸ Additional financing provided through the sale of participation certificates.

⁹ Participation sales authorization.

¹⁰ Not considered by House due to lack of legislative authorization.

¹¹ Excludes \$16,162,000 not considered by House due to lack of legislative authorization.

¹² Excludes \$230,000,000 advance funding for fiscal year 1970. Item transferred to Department of Transportation.

¹³ Includes \$100,000,000 transfer to "Urban renewal programs."

¹⁴ Includes \$500,000,000 transfer to "Urban renewal programs."

¹⁵ Not considered by House due to lack of legislative authorization.

¹⁶ By transfer.

¹⁷ Excludes \$25,000,000 new budget (obligational) authority included under "Housing for the elderly or handicapped fund."

¹⁸ Includes \$925,000,000 advance funding for fiscal year 1969.

Calendar No. 1354

90TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 17023

[Report No. 1375]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 10, 1968

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JULY 9, 1968

Reported, under authority of the order of the Senate of March 16, 1967, by
Mr. MAGNUSON, with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

AN ACT

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for sundry inde-
5 pendent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corpora-
6 tions, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing
7 and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June
8 30, 1969, and for other purposes, namely:

II

★(Star Print)

1

TITLE I

2

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

3

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL

4

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5

For expenses necessary for the National Aeronautics and

6

Space Council, established by section 201 of the National

7

Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C.

8

2471), including hire of passenger motor vehicles, reimburse-

9

ment of the General Services Administration for security

10

guard services, and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109,

11

\$500,000.

12

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING

13

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

14

For expenses necessary for the Office of Emergency

15

Planning, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109,

16

reimbursement of the General Services Administration for

17

security guard services, hire of passenger motor vehicles, and

18

expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and individuals

19

at meetings concerned with the work of emergency planning,

20

\$4,850,000.

21

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, TELECOMMUNICATIONS

22

For expenses necessary for the conduct of telecommuni-

23

cations functions assigned to the Director of Telecommunica-

24

tions Management, including services as authorized by 5

1 U.S.C. 3109, \$1,675,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed
2 \$500,000 of the foregoing amount shall remain available for
3 telecommunications studies and research until expended.

4 CIVIL DEFENSE AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION FUNCTIONS
5 OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

6 For expenses necessary to assist other Federal agencies
7 to perform civil defense and defense mobilization functions,
8 including payments by the Department of Labor to
9 State employment security agencies for the full cost of admin-
10 istration of defense manpower mobilization activities,
11 \$3,100,000.

12 OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
13 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

14 For expenses necessary for the Office of Science and
15 Technology, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C.
16 3109, ~~\$1,750,000~~ \$1,850,000.

17 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

18 APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

19 For expenses necessary to carry out the programs au-
20 thorized by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of
21 1965, as amended, except expenses authorized by section
22 105 of said Act, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C.
23 3109, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, ~~\$168,600,000~~
24 \$178,600,000, to remain available until expended.

1 DISASTER RELIEF

2 For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the
3 Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1855-
4 1855g) and section 9 of the Disaster Relief Act of 1966
5 (Public Law 89-769), authorizing assistance to States and
6 local governments in major disasters, ~~\$5,000,000~~ \$15,000,-
7 000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not
8 to exceed 3 per centum of the foregoing amount shall be
9 available for administrative expenses.

10 INDEPENDENT OFFICES

11 APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

12 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

13 For necessary expenses of the Federal Cochairman and
14 and his alternate on the Appalachian Regional Commission
15 and for payment of the Federal share of the administrative
16 expenses of the Commission, including services as authorized
17 by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and hire of passenger motor vehicles,
18 \$850,000.

19 CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

20 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

21 For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board,
22 including hire of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles;
23 services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; uniforms, or allow-
24 ances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902);

1 and not to exceed \$1,000 for official reception and repre-
2 sentation expenses, \$9,350,000.

3 PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS (LIQUIDATION OF
4 CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

5 For payments to air carriers of so much of the compen-
6 sation fixed and determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board
7 under section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49
8 U.S.C. 1376), as is payable by the Board, \$45,000,000, to
9 remain available until expended.

10 CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

11 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

12 For necessary expenses, including services as authorized
13 by 5 U.S.C. 3109; not to exceed \$10,000 for medical exam-
14 inations performed for veterans by private physicians on a
15 fee basis; payment in advance for library membership in
16 societies whose publications are available to members only or
17 to members at a price lower than to the general public; not to
18 exceed \$161,000 for performing the duties imposed upon the
19 Commission by chapter 15 of title 5, United States Code; and
20 not to exceed \$1,000 for official reception and representation
21 expenses; ~~\$37,000,000~~ \$37,564,000, including funding of
22 Interagency Boards of Examiners, together with not to exceed
23 \$6,460,000 for necessary expenses incurred during the cur-
24 rent fiscal year in the administration of the retirement and

1 insurance programs, to be transferred from the trust funds
2 "Civil Service retirement and disability fund", "Employees
3 life insurance fund", "Employees health benefits fund", and
4 "Retired employees health benefits fund", in such amounts as
5 may be determined by the Civil Service Commission, with-
6 out regard to the provisions of any other Act, but this pro-
7 vision shall not affect the authority of 5 U.S.C. 8348 (a) and
8 section 1 (b) of Public Law 89-205 (79 Stat. 840), pro-
9 viding for additional administrative expenses to effect an-
10 nuity adjustments under 5 U.S.C. 8340, section 1 (c) of
11 Public Law 89-205 (79 Stat. 840) and section 1 of
12 Public Law 89-314 (79 Stat. 1162): *Provided*, That
13 \$700,000 of this appropriation shall be available to carry
14 out the provisions of Executive Order 10422 of January 9,
15 1953, as amended, prescribing procedures for making avail-
16 able to the Secretary General of the United Nations, and the
17 executive heads of other international organizations, certain
18 information concerning United States citizens employed, or
19 being considered for employment by such organizations, in-
20 cluding advances or reimbursements to the applicable appro-
21 priations or funds of the Civil Service Commission and the
22 Federal Bureau of Investigation for expenses incurred by
23 such agencies under said Executive Order: *Provided further*,
24 That members of the International Organizations Employees

1 Loyalty Board may be paid actual transportation expenses,
2 and per diem in lieu of subsistence under 5 U.S.C. 5702,
3 while traveling on official business away from their homes or
4 regular places of business, including periods while en route
5 to and from and at the place where their services are to be
6 performed.

7 No part of the appropriations herein made to the Civil
8 Service Commission shall be available for the salaries and
9 expenses of the Legal Examining Unit in the Examining and
10 Personnel Utilization Division of the Commission, established
11 pursuant to Executive Order 9358 of July 1, 1943.

12 ANNUITIES UNDER SPECIAL ACTS

13 For payment of annuities authorized by the Act of
14 May 29, 1944, as amended (48 U.S.C. 1373a), and the Act
15 of August 19, 1950, as amended (33 U.S.C. 771-775),
16 \$1,350,000.

17 GOVERNMENT PAYMENT FOR ANNUITANTS, EMPLOYEES

18 HEALTH BENEFITS

19 For payment of Government contributions with respect
20 to retired employees, as authorized by chapter 89 of title 5,
21 United States Code, and the Retired Federal Employees
22 Health Benefits Act (74 Stat. 849), as amended, \$40,-
23 748,000, to remain available until expended.

1 PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND
2 DISABILITY FUND

3 For financing the estimated cost of new and increased
4 annuity benefits, during the current fiscal year, as provided
5 by part III of Public Law 87-793 (76 Stat. 868), \$72,000,-
6 000, to be credited to the civil service retirement and dis-
7 ability fund.

8 *COMMISSION ON EXECUTIVE, LEGISLATIVE, AND*
9 *JUDICIAL SALARIES*
10 *SALARIES AND EXPENSES*

11 *For necessary expenses of the Commission on Executive,*
12 *Legislative, and Judicial Salaries, authorized by section*
13 *225 of the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of*
14 *1967 (81 Stat. 642-645), \$100,000.*

15 **FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION**
16 **SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

For necessary expenses in performing the duties of the Commission as authorized by law, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902) ; not to exceed \$41,000 for land and structures; not to exceed \$11,000 for improvement and care of grounds and repairs to buildings; not to exceed \$500 for official reception

1 and representation expenses; special counsel fees; services
2 as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; and purchase of one passen-
3 ger motor vehicle for replacement only, ~~\$19,750,000~~
4 ~~\$20,000,000~~.

5 FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

6 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

7 For expenses necessary for the work of the Commission,
8 as authorized by law, including hire of passenger motor
9 vehicles, services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and not
10 to exceed \$500 for official reception and representation ex-
11 penses, ~~\$15,000,000~~ \$15,200,000.

12 FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

13 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

14 For necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commis-
15 sion, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as author-
16 ized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902), and services as author-
17 ized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$16,000,000: *Provided*, That no
18 part of the foregoing appropriation shall be expended upon
19 any investigation hereafter provided by concurrent resolu-
20 tion of the Congress until funds are appropriated subse-
21 quently to the enactment of such resolution to finance the
22 cost of such investigation.

1 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

2 OPERATING EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE

3 For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for,
4 of real property management and related activities as pro-
5 vided by law; rental of buildings in the District of Co-
6 lumbia; restoration of leased premises; moving Govern-
7 ment agencies (including space adjustments) in connection
8 with the assignment, allocation, and transfer of building
9 space; acquisition by purchase or otherwise of real estate
10 and interests therein; and contractual services incident to
11 cleaning or servicing buildings and moving; ~~\$271,881,000~~
12 *\$276,763,000: Provided, That this appropriation shall be*
13 *available to provide such fencing, lighting, guard booths,*
14 *and other facilities on private or other property not in Gov-*
15 *ernment ownership or control as may be appropriate to*
16 *enable the United States Secret Service to perform its pro-*
17 *TECTIVE functions pursuant to title 18, U.S.C. 3056.*

18 REPAIR AND IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

19 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to
20 alter public buildings and to acquire additions to sites pursu-
21 ant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479) and
22 to alter other Federally-owned buildings and to acquire
23 additions to sites thereof, including grounds, approaches and
24 appurtenances, wharves and piers, together with the neces-
25 sary dredging adjacent thereto; and care and safeguarding of

1 sites; preliminary planning of projects by contract or other-
2 wise; maintenance, preservation, demolition, and equipment;
3 \$80,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*,
4 That for the purposes of this appropriation, buildings con-
5 structed pursuant to the Public Buildings Purchase Contract
6 Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356) and the Post Office Depart-
7 ment Property Act of 1954 (39 U.S.C. 2104 et seq.), and
8 buildings under the control of another department or agency
9 where alteration of such buildings is required in connection
10 with the moving of such other department or agency from
11 buildings then, or thereafter to be, under the control of Gen-
12 eral Services Administration shall be considered to be public
13 buildings.

14 SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

15 For an additional amount for expenses necessary in
16 connection with the construction of public buildings projects
17 not otherwise provided for, as specified under this head in
18 the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts of 1959 and
19 1960, including preliminary planning of public buildings
20 projects by contract or otherwise, \$10,995,000, to remain
21 available until expended.

22 PAYMENTS, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PURCHASE CONTRACTS

23 For payments of principal, interest, taxes, and any other
24 obligations under contracts entered into pursuant to the

1 Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C.
2 356), \$2,400,000.

3 EXPENSES, UNITED STATES COURT FACILITIES

4 For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, to
5 provide directly or indirectly, additional space for the United
6 States Courts incident to expansion of facilities (including
7 rental of buildings in the District of Columbia and elsewhere
8 and moving and space adjustments), and furniture and fur-
9 nishings, \$750,000.

10 OPERATING EXPENSES, FEDERAL SUPPLY SERVICE

11 For expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary for sup-
12 ply distribution, procurement, inspection, operation of the
13 stores depot system (including contractual services incident
14 to receiving, handling, and shipping warehouse items), and
15 other supply management and related activities, as authorized
16 by law, \$72,500,000.

17 OPERATING EXPENSES, NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND

18 RECORDS SERVICE

19 For necessary expenses in connection with Federal
20 records management and related activities, as provided by
21 law, including reimbursement for security guard services,
22 and contractual services incident to movement or disposal of
23 records, \$18,300,000.

1 NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS GRANTS

2 For allocation to Federal agencies, and for grants to
3 State and local agencies and nonprofit organizations and in-
4 stitutions, for the collecting, describing, preserving and com-
5 piling, and publishing of documentary sources significant to
6 the history of the United States, \$350,000, to remain avail-
7 able until expended.

8 OPERATING EXPENSES, TRANSPORTATION AND

9 COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE

10 For necessary expenses of transportation, communica-
11 tions, and other public utilities management and related
12 activities, as provided by law, including services as author-
13 ized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$6,150,000.

14 OPERATING EXPENSES, PROPERTY MANAGEMENT AND

15 DISPOSAL SERVICE

16 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary
17 for carrying out the functions of the Administrator with
18 respect to the utilization of excess property; the disposal
19 of surplus property; the rehabilitation of personal property;
20 the appraisal of real and personal property; the national
21 stockpile established by the Strategic and Critical Materials
22 Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98-98h) ; the supplemental
23 stockpile established by section 104 (b) of the Agricultural

1 Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat.
2 456, as amended by 73 Stat. 607) ; the national industrial
3 reserve established by the National Industrial Reserve Act
4 of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451-462) ; including services as
5 authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and reimbursement for
6 security guard services, \$28,500,000, to be derived from
7 proceeds from transfers of excess property, disposal of surplus
8 property, and sales of stockpile materials: *Provided*, That
9 during the current fiscal year the General Services Adminis-
10 tration is authorized to acquire leasehold interests in prop-
11 erty, for periods not in excess of twenty years, for the
12 storage, security, and maintenance of strategic, critical, and
13 other materials in the national and supplemental stockpiles
14 provided said leasehold interests are at nominal cost to the
15 Government: *Provided further*, That during the current
16 fiscal year there shall be no limitation on the value of surplus
17 strategic and critical materials which, in accordance with
18 section 6 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling
19 Act (50 U.S.C. 98e), may be transferred without reim-
20 bursement to the national stockpile: *Provided further*, That
21 during the current fiscal year materials in the inventory
22 maintained under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as
23 amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2061-2166), and excess ma-
24 terials in the national stockpile and the supplemental stock-
25 pile, the disposition of which is authorized by law, shall be

1 available, without reimbursement, for transfer at fair market
2 value to contractors as payment for expenses (including
3 transportation and other accessorial expenses) of acquisition
4 of materials, or of refining, processing, or otherwise bene-
5 ficiating materials, or of rotating materials, pursuant to sec-
6 tion 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling
7 Act (50 U.S.C. 98b), and of processing and refining ma-
8 terials pursuant to section 303 (d) of the Defense Production
9 Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2093 (d)).

10 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

11 For expenses of executive direction for activities under
12 the control of the General Services Administration, \$1,820,-
13 000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$500 shall be available
14 for reception and representation expenses.

15 ALLOWANCES AND OFFICE FACILITIES FOR FORMER

16 PRESIDENTS

17 For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August
18 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 838), \$267,000: *Provided*, That the
19 Administrator of General Services shall transfer to the Secre-
20 tary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to carry
21 out the provisions of sections (a) and (e) of such Act.

22 EXPENSES, PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION

23 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the
24 Presidential Transition Act of 1963 (3 U.S.C. 102, note),
25 \$900,000, to remain available until June 30, 1970.

1 ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS FUND

2 Funds available to General Services Administration for
3 administrative operations, in support of program activities,
4 shall be expended and accounted for, as a whole, through a
5 single fund: *Provided*, That costs and obligations for such
6 administrative operations for the respective program activ-
7 ities shall be accounted for in accordance with systems ap-
8 proved by the General Accounting Office: *Provided further*,
9 That the total amount deposited into said account for the cur-
10 rent fiscal year from funds made available to General Services
11 Administration in this Act shall not exceed \$13,700,000:
12 *Provided further*, That amounts deposited into said account
13 for administrative operations for each program shall not
14 exceed the amounts included in the respective program
15 appropriations for such purposes.

16 GENERAL PROVISIONS

17 The appropriate appropriation or fund available to the
18 General Services Administration shall be credited with (1)
19 cost of operation, protection, maintenance, upkeep, repair,
20 and improvement, included as part of rentals received from
21 Government corporations pursuant to law (40 U.S.C. 129) ;
22 (2) reimbursements for services performed in respect to
23 bonds and other obligations under the jurisdiction of the
24 General Services Administration, issued by public authori-

ties, States, or other public bodies, and such services in respect to such bonds or obligations as the Administrator deems necessary and in the public interest may, upon the request and at the expense of the issuing agencies, be provided from the appropriate foregoing appropriation; and (3) appropriations or funds available to other agencies, and transferred to the General Services Administration, in connection with property transferred to the General Services Administration pursuant to the Act of July 2, 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451ff), and such appropriations or funds may be so transferred, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

Appropriations to the General Services Administration under the heading "Construction, Public Buildings Projects" shall be available, subject to the provisions of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 for (1) acquisition of buildings and sites thereof by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, including prepayment of purchase contracts, (2) extension or conversion of Government-owned buildings, and (3) construction of new buildings, in addition to those set forth under that appropriation: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall authorize an expenditure of funds for acquisition, extension or conversion, or construction without the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives.

1 Funds available to the General Services Administration
2 shall be available for the hire of passenger motor vehicles.

3 No part of any money appropriated by this or any
4 other Act for any agency of the executive branch of the
5 Government shall be used during the current fiscal year for
6 the purchase within the continental limits of the United
7 States of any typewriting machines except in accordance
8 with regulations issued pursuant to the provisions of the
9 Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949,
10 as amended.

11 Not to exceed 2 per centum of any appropriation made
12 available to the General Services Administration for the
13 current fiscal year by this Act may be transferred to any
14 other such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be
15 increased thereby more than 2 per centum: *Provided*, That
16 such transfers shall apply only to operating expenses, and
17 shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount of \$2,000,000.

18 Appropriations available to any department or agency
19 during the current fiscal year for necessary expenses, includ-
20 ing maintenance or operating expenses, shall also be available
21 for (a) reimbursement to the General Services Administra-
22 tion for those expenses of renovation and alteration of build-
23 ings and facilities which constitute public improvements, per-
24 formed in accordance with the Public Buildings Act of 1959
25 (73 Stat. 479) or other applicable law, and (b) transfer or

1 reimbursement to applicable appropriations to said Adminis-
2 tration for rents and related expenses, not otherwise provided
3 for, of providing subject to Executive Order 11035, dated
4 July 9, 1962, directly or indirectly, suitable general purpose
5 space for any such department or agency, in the District of
6 Columbia or elsewhere.

7 No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall
8 be used for the payment of rental on lease agreements for the
9 accommodation of Federal agencies in buildings and improve-
10 ments which are to be erected by the lessor for such agencies
11 at an estimated cost of construction in excess of \$200,000 or
12 for the payment of the salary of any person who executes
13 such a lease agreement: *Provided*, That the foregoing proviso
14 shall not be applicable to projects for which a prospectus for
15 the lease construction of space has been submitted to the Con-
16 gress and approval made in the same manner as for the
17 public buildings construction projects pursuant to the Public
18 Buildings Act of 1959.

19 INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

20 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

21 For necessary expenses of the Interstate Commerce
22 Commission, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C.
23 3109, \$23,846,000, of which \$150,000 shall be available for
24 valuation of pipelines: *Provided*, That Joint Board members
25 and cooperating State commissioners may use Government

1 transportation requests when traveling in connection with
2 their duties as such.

3 NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE

4 ADMINISTRATION

5 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

6 For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for,
7 including research, development, operations, services, minor
8 construction, supplies, materials, equipment; maintenance, re-
9 pair, and alteration of real and personal property; and pur-
10 chase, hire, maintenance, and operation of other than admin-
11 istrative aircraft necessary for the conduct and support of
12 aeronautical and space research and development activities of
13 the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, ~~\$3,383,-~~
14 ~~250,000~~ \$3,370,300,000, to remain available until expended.

15 CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

16 For advance planning, design, and construction of facili-
17 ties for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration,
18 and for the acquisition or condemnation of real property, as
19 authorized by law, ~~\$21,800,000~~ \$34,750,000, to remain
20 available until expended.

21 ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS

22 For necessary expenses of operation of the National
23 Aeronautics and Space Administration, not otherwise pro-
24 vided for, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as au-
25 thorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902) : minor construc-

1 tion; supplies, materials, services, and equipment; awards;
2 hire, maintenance and operation of administrative aircraft;
3 purchase (not to exceed ten for replacement only) and hire
4 of passenger motor vehicles; and maintenance, repair, and
5 alteration of real and personal property; \$603,173,000: *Pro-*
6 *vided*, That contracts may be entered into under this appro-
7 priation for maintenance and operation of facilities, and for
8 other services, to be provided during the next fiscal year.

9 GENERAL PROVISIONS

10 Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation made
11 available to the National Aeronautics and Space Adminis-
12 tration by this Act may be transferred to any other such
13 appropriation.

14 Not to exceed \$35,000 of the appropriation "Adminis-
15 trative Operations" in this Act for the National Aeronautics
16 and Space Administration shall be available for scientific
17 consultations or extraordinary expense, to be expended upon
18 the approval or authority of the Administrator and his deter-
19 mination shall be final and conclusive.

20 NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

21 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

22 For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the
23 National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42
24 U.S.C. 1861-1875) Title IX of the National Defense Edu-
25 cation Act of 1958 (42 U.S.C. 1876-1879), the National

1 Sea Grant Colleges and Program Act of 1966 (80 Stat.
 2 998), and the Act to establish a National Medal of Science
 3 (42 U.S.C. 1880-1881), including award of graduate fellow-
 4 ships; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; *purchase of*
 5 *one aircraft*; maintenance and operation of ~~three~~ *four* air-
 6 craft and purchase of flight services for research support; hire
 7 of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed \$2,500 for of-
 8 ficial reception and representation expenses; uniforms or al-
 9 lowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-
 10 5902); rental of conference rooms in the District of Colum-
 11 bia; and reimbursement of the General Services Admini-
 12 stration for security guard services; ~~\$400,000,000~~, *\$410,-*
 13 *000,000*, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That
 14 of the foregoing amount not less than \$37,600,000 shall be
 15 available for tuition, grants, and allowances in connection
 16 with a program of supplementary training for secondary
 17 school science and mathematics teachers: *Provided further*,
 18 That receipts for scientific support services and materials
 19 furnished by the National Research Centers may be credited
 20 to this appropriation: ~~And provided further~~, That no part
 21 of this appropriation shall be available for or paid out to
 22 the benefit of any individual who at any time after the effec-
 23 tive date of this Act, wilfully refuses to obey a lawful regu-

1 lation of the university or college which he is attending or at
 2 which he is employed. : And provided further, That if an
 3 institution of higher education receiving funds hereunder
 4 determines after affording notice and opportunity for hear-
 5 ing to an individual attending, or employed by, such institu-
 6 tion, that such individual has, after the date of enactment
 7 of this Act, willfully refused to obey a lawful regulation
 8 or order of such institution and that such refusal was of a
 9 serious nature and contributed to the disruption of the
 10 administration of such institution, then the institution shall
 11 deny any further payment to, or for the benefit of, such
 12 individual.

13 RENEGOTIATION BOARD

14 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

15 For necessary expenses of the Renegotiation Board, in-
 16 cluding hire of passenger motor vehicles and services as
 17 authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, ~~\$3,000,000~~ \$3,080,000.

18 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

19 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

20 For necessary expenses, including uniforms or allow-
 21 ances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902),
 22 and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, ~~\$17,730,000~~
 23 \$17,830,000.

1 SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For expenses necessary for the operation and mainte-
4 nance of the Selective Service System, as authorized by title
5 I of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 (62 Stat.
6 604), as amended, including services as authorized by 5
7 U.S.C. 3109; expenses of attendance at meetings and of
8 training for uniformed personnel assigned to the Selective
9 Service System, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2301-
10 2318) for civilian employees; hire of motor vehicles; pur-
11 chase of thirteen passenger motor vehicles for replacement
12 only; not to exceed \$71,000 for the National Selective Serv-
13 ice Appeal Board; and \$60,000 for the National Advisory
14 Committee on the Selection of Physicians, Dentists, and
15 Allied Specialists; \$63,568,000: *Provided*, That during the
16 current fiscal year, the President may exempt this appro-
17 priation from the provisions of subsection (c) of section
18 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, whenever he
19 deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national
20 defense.

21 VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

22 COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

23 For the payment of compensation, pensions, gratuities,
24 and allowances, including burial awards, burial flags, sub-
25 sistence allowances for vocational rehabilitation, emergency
26 and other officers' retirement pay, adjusted-service credits

1 and certificates, as authorized by law; and for payment of
2 amounts of compromises or settlements under 28 U.S.C.
3 2677 of tort claims potentially subject to the offset provisions
4 of 38 U.S.C. 351, \$4,654,336,000, to remain available until
5 expended.

6 READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

7 For the payment of readjustment and rehabilitation
8 benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by law (38
9 U.S.C. chapters 21, 31 (except section 1504), and 33-39),
10 \$612,000,000, to remain available until expended.

11 VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

12 For military and naval insurance, national service life
13 insurance, servicemen's indemnities, and service-disabled
14 veterans insurance, to remain available until expended,
15 \$11,850,000, of which \$2,500,000 shall be derived from the
16 Veterans Special Term Insurance Fund.

17 MEDICAL CARE

18 For expenses necessary for the maintenance and opera-
19 tion of hospitals, nursing homes, and domiciliary facilities;
20 for furnishing, as authorized by law, inpatient and out-
21 patient care and treatment to beneficiaries of the Veterans
22 Administration including care and treatment in facilities
23 not under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration,
24 and furnishing recreational facilities, supplies and equipment;
25 maintenance and operation of farms and burial grounds;

1 repairing, altering, improving or providing facilities in the
 2 several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the
 3 Veterans Administration, not otherwise provided for, either
 4 by contract or by the hire of temporary employees and pur-
 5 chase of materials; uniforms or allowance therefor as author-
 6 ized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902) ; and aid to State homes
 7 as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 641) ; \$1,420,264,000,
 8 plus reimbursements: *Provided*, That allotments and trans-
 9 fers may be made from this appropriation to the Public
 10 Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and
 11 Welfare, and the Army, Navy, and Air Force of the De-
 12 partment of Defense, for disbursements by them under the
 13 various headings of their applicable appropriations, of such
 14 amounts as are necessary for the care and treatment of bene-
 15 ficiaries of the Veterans Administration.

16 MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH

17 For expenses necessary for carrying out programs of
 18 medical and prosthetic research and development, as author-
 19 ized by law, to remain available until expended, ~~\$45,850,-~~
 20 ~~000~~ \$46,850,000.

21 MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS

22 OPERATING EXPENSES

23 For expenses necessary for administration of the medical,
 24 hospital, domiciliary, construction and supply, research,
 25 employee education and training activities, as authorized by

1 law, and for carrying out the provisions of section 5055, title
2 38, United States Code, relating to pilot programs and grants
3 for exchange of medical information, \$14,200,000.

4 GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

5 For necessary operating expenses of the Veterans Ad-
6 ministration, not otherwise provided for, including uniforms
7 or allowances therefor, as authorized by law; not to exceed
8 \$1,000 for official reception and representation expenses;
9 purchase of one passenger motor vehicle (medium sedan
10 for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles;
11 and reimbursement of the General Services Administration
12 for security guard services; ~~\$195,000,000~~ \$197,000,000:
13 *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to
14 pay in excess of twenty-two persons engaged in public rela-
15 tions work.

16 CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY 17 FACILITIES

18 For hospital and domiciliary facilities, for planning and
19 for major alterations, improvements, and repairs and extend-
20 ing any of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the Veterans
21 Administration or for any of the purposes set forth in sections
22 5001, 5002, and 5004, title 38, United States Code, includ-
23 ing necessary expenses of administration, \$7,926,000, to
24 remain available until expended.

1 GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF STATE NURSING HOMES

2 For grants to assist the several States to construct State
3 home facilities for furnishing nursing home care to veterans,
4 as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 5031-5037), \$4,000,000,
5 to remain available until June 30, 1971.

6 GRANTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

7 For payment to the Republic of the Philippines of
8 grants, as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 631-634),
9 \$1,776,000.

10 LOAN GUARANTY REVOLVING FUND

11 During the current fiscal year, the Loan guaranty revolv-
12 ing fund shall be available for expenses, but not to exceed
13 \$450,000,000, for property acquisitions and other loan guar-
14 anty and insurance operations under Chapter 37, title 38,
15 United States Code, except administrative expenses, as au-
16 thorized by section 1824 of such title: *Provided*, That the
17 unobligated balances including retained earnings of the Direct
18 loan revolving fund shall be available, during the current
19 fiscal year, for transfer to the Loan guaranty revolving fund
20 in such amounts as may be necessary to provide for the
21 timely payment of obligations of such fund and the Admin-
22 istrator of Veterans Affairs shall not be required to pay inter-
23 est on amounts so transferred after the time of such transfer.

1 PAYMENT OF PARTICIPATION SALES INSUFFICIENCIES

2 For the payment of such insufficiencies as may be re-
3 quired by the Federal National Mortgage Association, as
4 trustee, on account of outstanding beneficial interests or par-
5 ticipations in Direct Loan Revolving Fund assets or Loan
6 Guaranty Revolving Fund assets authorized by law to be
7 issued pursuant to section 302 (c) of the Federal National
8 Mortgage Association Charter Act, as amended, \$9,505,000.

9 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

10 Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation for the
11 current fiscal year for "Compensation and pensions", "Re-
12 adjustment benefits", and "Veterans insurance and indemni-
13 ties" may be transferred to any other of the mentioned ap-
14 propriations, but not to exceed 10 per centum of the appro-
15 priations so augmented.

16 Appropriations available to the Veterans Administra-
17 tion for the current fiscal year for salaries and expenses
18 shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C.
19 3109.

20 The appropriation available to the Veterans Administra-
21 tion for the current fiscal year for "Medical care" shall be
22 available for funeral, burial, and other expenses incidental
23 thereto (except burial awards authorized by 38 U.S.C. 902),

1 for beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration receiving
2 care under such appropriations.

3 No part of the appropriations in this Act for the Veter-
4 ans Administration (except the appropriation for "Construc-
5 tion of hospital and domiciliary facilities") shall be available
6 for the purchase of any site for or toward the construction
7 of any new hospital or home.

8 No part of the foregoing appropriations shall be avail-
9 able for hospitalization or examination of any persons except
10 beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such benefits
11 to veterans, unless reimbursement of cost is made to the ap-
12 propriation at such rates as may be fixed by the Administra-
13 tor of Veterans Affairs.

14 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

15 CIVIL DEFENSE

16 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

17 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for
18 carrying out civil defense activities, including the hire of
19 motor vehicles; and financial contributions to the States for
20 civil defense purposes, as authorized by law, ~~\$48,040,000~~
21 \$48,640,000, and in addition, \$50,000 which shall be de-
22 rived by transfer from Civil Defense Procurement Fund

1 established by the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act,
2 1951 (50 U.S.C. App. 2264) : *Provided*, That not to exceed
3 ~~\$18,500,000~~ \$19,100,000 shall be available for allocation
4 under section 205 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950,
5 as amended.

6 RESEARCH, SHELTER SURVEY AND MARKING

7 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for
8 studies and research to develop measures and plans for civil
9 defense; and continuing shelter surveys, marking, stocking,
10 and equipping surveyed spaces; ~~\$10,000,000~~ \$15,000,000,
11 to remain available until expended.

12 GENERAL PROVISIONS—CIVIL DEFENSE

13 Appropriations contained in this Act for carrying out
14 civil defense activities shall not be available in excess of the
15 limitations on appropriations contained in section 408 of the
16 Federal Civil Defense Act, as amended (50 U.S.C. App.
17 2260).

18 No part of any appropriation in this Act shall be
19 available for the construction of warehouses or for the lease
20 of warehouse space in any building which is to be constructed
21 specifically for civil defense activities.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN

DEVELOPMENT

RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY OR HANDICAPPED FUND

For the revolving fund established pursuant to section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701q et seq.), \$25,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ALASKA HOUSING

For assistance in the provision of housing and related facilities for Alaska natives and other Alaska residents, as authorized by section 1004 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (80 Stat. 1284-1285), \$1,000,000.

GRANTS FOR NEIGHBORHOOD FACILITIES

For grants authorized by section 703 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3103), \$35,000,000, to remain available until expended.

LOW RENT PUBLIC HOUSING ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

For the payment of annual contributions to public housing agencies in accordance with section 10 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1410), \$350,000,000.

1 **URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAMS**

2 *For grants for urban renewal, fiscal year 1970, as an*
3 *additional amount for urban renewal programs, as author-*
4 *ized by title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended*
5 *(42 U.S.C. 1450 et seq.) and section 314 of the Housing*
6 *Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1452a), \$1,300-*
7 *000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided,*
8 *That no part of any appropriation in this Act shall be*
9 *used for administrative expenses in connection with commit-*
10 *ments for grants aggregating more than the total of amounts*
11 *available in the current year from the amounts authorized*
12 *for making such commitments through June 30, 1968, plus*
13 *the additional amounts appropriated therefor.*

14 **SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

15 For necessary administrative expenses of programs of
16 renewal and housing assistance, not otherwise provided for,
17 \$34,000,000.

18 **METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT**19 **URBAN PLANNING GRANTS**

20 For an additional amount for "Urban planning grants",
21 \$38,838,000, to remain available until expended.

22 **OPEN SPACE LAND PROGRAMS**

23 For grants as authorized by title VII of the Housing
24 Act of 1961, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1500-1500e), and the

1 provision of technical assistance to State and local public
2 bodies (including the undertaking of studies and publication
3 of information), \$75,000,000, to remain available until ex-
4 pended: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation in this
5 Act shall be used for administrative expenses in connection
6 with commitments entered into during the current fiscal
7 year for grants aggregating more than the total amounts
8 available in the current year from amounts heretofore appro-
9 priated for making such commitments through June 30,
10 1967, plus the additional amount appropriated herein: *Pro-*
11 *vided further*, That no part of this appropriation may be
12 used for financing a grant in excess of 50 per centum of the
13 cost of any activity or project.

14 GRANTS FOR BASIC WATER AND SEWER FACILITIES

15 For grants authorized by section 702 of the Housing
16 and Urban Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3102),
17 ~~\$150,000,000~~ \$165,000,000, to remain available until
18 expended.

19 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

20 For necessary administrative expenses of programs of
21 metropolitan development, not otherwise provided for,
22 \$7,000,000.

1 DEMONSTRATIONS AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

2 MODEL CITIES PROGRAMS

3 For financial assistance and administrative expenses in
 4 connection with planning and carrying out comprehensive
 5 city demonstration programs, as authorized by title I of the
 6 Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act
 7 of 1966 (80 Stat. 1255-1261), including ~~\$100,000,000~~
 8 ~~\$500,000,000~~ for grants for urban renewal projects within
 9 approved city demonstration programs, to be transferred to
 10 and merged with the appropriation "Urban renewal pro-
 11 grams" for the fiscal year 1969 in accordance with and sub-
 12 ject to the provisions of section 113 of said Act, ~~\$500,000,-~~
 13 ~~000~~ \$1,000,000,000: *Provided*, That the amount appropri-
 14 ated herein for other than urban renewal programs shall
 15 remain available until June 30, 1970.

16 URBAN INFORMATION AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

17 *For grants authorized by title IX of the Demonstration*
 18 *Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (80 Stat.*
 19 *1282-1284), \$2,500,000.*

20 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT TRAINING PROGRAMS

21 For matching grants to States for training and related
 22 activities, and for expenses of providing technical assistance

1 to State and local governmental or public bodies (including
 2 studies and publication of information), as authorized by
 3 title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964 (20 U.S.C. 801-
 4 805), \$3,000,000.

5 FELLOWSHIPS FOR CITY PLANNING AND URBAN STUDIES

6 For fellowships for city planning and urban studies as
 7 authorized by section 810 of the Housing Act of 1964 (20
 8 U.S.C. 811), \$500,000.

9 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

10 For necessary administrative expenses of programs of
 11 demonstrations and intergovernmental relations, not other-
 12 wise provided for, ~~\$1,860,000~~ \$1,400,000, together with not
 13 to exceed \$6,000,000 to be derived from the appropriation
 14 for "Model cities programs": *Provided*, That no part of this
 15 or any other appropriation in this Act may be used to provide
 16 metropolitan expeditors, ~~or for the administrative or imple-~~
 17 ~~mentation of section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and~~
 18 ~~Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (Public Law~~
 19 ~~89-754).~~

20 URBAN RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

21 For necessary expenses of programs of research and
 22 studies relating to housing and urban problems, not other-
 23 wise provided for, as authorized by law (12 U.S.C. 1701d-
 24 3; 1701e; 1701f; 79 Stat. 668; 80 Stat. 1286-1287),
 25 ~~\$10,000,000~~ \$15,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed

1 ~~\$500,000~~ of the foregoing amount shall be available for
2 administrative expenses.

3 LOW INCOME HOUSING DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS

4 For low income housing demonstration programs pur-
5 suant to section 207 of the Housing Act of 1961, as
6 amended (42 U.S.C. 1436), \$2,000,000: *Provided*, That
7 no part of any appropriation in this Act shall be available
8 for administrative expenses in connection with contracts to
9 make grants in excess of the amount herein appropriated.

10 MORTGAGE CREDIT

11 RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM

12 For rent supplement payments authorized by section
13 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965,
14 \$12,000,000: *Provided*, That the limitation otherwise ap-
15 plicable to the maximum payments that may be required
16 in any fiscal year by all contracts entered into under such
17 section is increased by ~~\$25,000,000~~ \$65,000,000: *Provided*
18 *further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation or con-
19 tract authority shall be used for incurring any obligation in
20 connection with any dwelling unit or project which is not
21 either part of a workable program for community improve-
22 ment meeting the requirements of section 101(c) of the
23 Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1451 (c)), or
24 which is without local official approval for participation in
25 this program.

1 For necessary administrative expenses of the Federal
2 Housing Administration in carrying out functions under sec-
3 tion 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of
4 1965, delegated by the Secretary, \$1,350,000.

5 DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

6 GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

7 For necessary administrative expenses of the Secretary,
8 not otherwise provided for, in overall program planning
9 and direction in the Department, including not to exceed
10 \$2,500 for official reception and representation expenses,
11 \$6,000,000.

12 REGIONAL MANAGEMENT AND SERVICES

13 For necessary administrative expenses, not otherwise
14 provided for, of management and program coordination in
15 the regional offices of the Department, \$6,500,000.

16 FAIR HOUSING PROGRAM

17 *For expenses necessary to carry out the functions of the*
18 *Secretary of Housing and Urban Development under the*
19 *provisions of Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968*
20 *(82 Stat. 81), \$9,000,000.*

21 PAYMENT OF PARTICIPATION SALES INSUFFICIENCIES

22 For the payment of such insufficiencies as may be re-
23 quired by the Federal National Mortgage Association, as
24 trustee, on account of outstanding beneficial interests or par-
25 ticipations in assets of the Department of Housing and Urban

1 Development (including the Federal National Mortgage
2 Association) authorized by law to be issued pursuant to sec-
3 tion 302 (c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association
4 Charter Act, as amended, \$47,638,000.

5 GENERAL PROVISIONS

6 SEC. 102. Where appropriations in this title are expend-
7 able for travel expenses of employees and no specific limita-
8 tion has been placed thereon, the expenditures for such travel
9 expenses may not exceed the amounts set forth therefor in
10 the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations: *Pro-*
11 *vided*, That this section shall not apply to travel performed
12 by uncompensated officials of local boards and appeal boards
13 of the Selective Service System; to travel performed in con-
14 nection with the investigation of aircraft accidents by the
15 Civil Aeronautics Board; to travel performed directly in con-
16 nection with care and treatment of medical beneficiaries of
17 the Veterans Administration; or to payments to interagency
18 motor pool where separately set forth in the budget schedules.

19 SEC. 103. No part of any appropriation contained in this
20 title shall be available to pay the salary of any person filling
21 a position, other than a temporary position, formerly held by
22 an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces of the
23 United States and has satisfactorily completed his period of
24 active military or naval service and has within ninety days
25 after his release from such service or from hospitalization con-

1 tinuing after discharge for a period of not more than one year
2 made application for restoration to his former position and
3 has been certified by the Civil Service Commission as still
4 qualified to perform the duties of his former position and has
5 not been restored thereto.

6 SEC. 104. No part of any appropriation made available
7 by the provisions of this title shall be used for the purchase
8 or sale of real estate or for the purpose of establishing new
9 offices outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That this
10 limitation shall not apply to programs which have been
11 approved by the Congress and appropriations made therefor.

12 TITLE II III—CORPORATIONS

13 The following corporations and agencies, respectively,
14 are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within
15 the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each
16 such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to
17 make such contracts and commitments without regard to
18 fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the
19 Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may
20 be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the
21 Budget for the current fiscal year for each such corporation
22 or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

1 FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

2 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRA-
3 TIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK
4 BOARD

5 Not to exceed a total of \$5,000,000 shall be available
6 for administrative expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank
7 Board, which may procure services as authorized by 5 U.S.C.
8 3109, and contracts for such services with one organization
9 may be renewed annually, and uniforms or allowances there-
10 for in accordance with law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902) , and said
11 amount shall be derived from funds available to the Federal
12 Home Loan Bank Board, including those in the Federal
13 Home Loan Bank Board revolving fund and receipts of the
14 Board for the current fiscal year and prior fiscal years, and
15 the Board may utilize and may make payment for services
16 and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal
17 Reserve banks, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance
18 Corporation, and other agencies of the Government (includ-
19 ing payment for office space) : *Provided*, That all necessary
20 expenses in connection with the conservatorship of institu-
21 tions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance
22 Corporation or activities relating to section 6 (i) of the Fed-

1 eral Home Loan Bank Act, section 5 (d) of the Home Own-
2 ers' Loan Act of 1933, or section 407 or 408 of the National
3 Housing Act and all necessary expenses (including services
4 performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other
5 personal services) in connection with the handling, including
6 the purchase, sale, and exchange, of securities on behalf of
7 Federal home-loan banks, and the sale, issuance, and retire-
8 ment of, or payment of interest on, debentures or bonds, under
9 the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, shall be con-
10 sidered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof:
11 *Provided further*, That members and alternates of the Federal
12 Savings and Loan Advisory Council shall be entitled to reim-
13 bursement from the Board as approved by the Board for
14 transportation expenses incurred in attendance at meetings of
15 or concerned with the work of such Council and may be paid
16 not to exceed \$25 per diem in lieu of subsistence: *Provided*
17 *further*, That expenses of any functions of supervision (ex-
18 cept of Federal home-loan banks) vested in or exercisable
19 by the Board shall be considered as nonadministrative ex-
20 penses: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$1,000 shall be
21 available for official reception and representation expenses:
22 *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provisions
23 of this Act, except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore
24 specified, the administrative expenses and other obligations
25 of the Board shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accord-

1 ance with the provisions of the Federal Home Loan Bank
2 Act of July 22, 1932, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1421-1449) :
3 *Provided further*, That the nonadministrative expenses (ex-
4 cept those included in the first proviso hereof) for the super-
5 vision and examination of Federal and State chartered institu-
6 tions (other than special examinations determined by the
7 Board to be necessary) shall not exceed \$14,396,000.

8 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL
9 SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

10 Not to exceed \$340,000 shall be available for
11 administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual
12 basis and shall be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation,
13 properly capitalized expenditures, expenses in connection
14 with liquidation of insured institutions or activities relat-
15 ing to section 407 or 408 of the National Housing Act,
16 liquidation or handling of assets of or derived from insured
17 institutions, payment of insurance, and action for or toward
18 the avoidance, termination, or minimizing of losses in the
19 case of insured institutions, legal fees and expenses, and pay-
20 ments for expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board
21 determined by said Board to be properly allocable to said
22 Corporation, and said Corporation may utilize and may make
23 payments for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan
24 banks, the Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Home Loan
25 Bank Board, and other agencies of the Government: *Pro-*

1 *vided*, That, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act,
2 except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the
3 administrative expenses and other obligations of said Cor-
4 poration shall be incurred, allowed and paid in accordance
5 with title IV of the Act of June 27, 1934, as amended (12
6 U.S.C. 1724-1730b).

7 DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN
8 DEVELOPMENT

9 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, HOUSING
10 FOR THE ELDERLY OR HANDICAPPED

11 Not to exceed \$1,272,000 of funds in the revolving fund
12 established pursuant to section 202 of the Housing Act of
13 1959, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701q et seq.), shall be
14 available for administrative expenses.

15 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, COLLEGE
16 HOUSING LOANS

17 Not to exceed \$2,275,000 shall be available for all ad-
18 ministrative expenses of carrying out the program of housing
19 loans to educational institutions (12 U.S.C. 1749-1749d).

20 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, PUBLIC
21 FACILITY LOANS

22 Not to exceed \$1,227,000 of funds in the revolving fund
23 established pursuant to title II of the Housing Amendments
24 of 1955, as amended, shall be available for administrative
25 expenses.

1 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, REVOLVING
2 FUND (LIQUIDATING PROGRAMS)

3 During the current fiscal year not to exceed \$100,000
4 shall be available for administrative expenses, but this amount
5 shall be exclusive of expenses necessary in the case of de-
6 faulted obligations to protect the interests of the Government.

7 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRA-
8 TIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

9 For administrative expenses in carrying out duties im-
10 posed by or pursuant to law, not to exceed ~~\$11,500,000~~
11 \$11,675,000 of the various funds of the Federal Housing
12 Administration shall be available, in accordance with the
13 National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701) :
14 *Provided*, That funds shall be available for contract actuarial
15 services (not to exceed \$1,500) : *Provided, further*, That
16 nonadministrative expenses classified by section 2 of Public
17 Law 387, approved October 25, 1949, shall not exceed
18 ~~\$92,000,000~~ \$94,000,000.

19 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL
20 NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

21 Not to exceed \$10,000,000 shall be available for admin-
22 istrative expenses, which shall be on accrual basis, and shall
23 be exclusive of interest paid, expenses (including expenses
24 for fiscal agency services performed on a contract or fee
25 basis) in connection with the issuance and servicing of se-

1 curities, depreciation, properly capitalized expenditures, fees
2 for servicing mortgages, expenses (including services per-
3 formed on a force account, contract or fee basis, but not in-
4 cluding other personal services) in connection with the ac-
5 quisition, protection, operation, maintenance, improvement,
6 or disposition of real or personal property belonging to said
7 Association or in which it has an interest, cost of salaries,
8 wages, travel, and other expenses of persons employed out-
9 side of the continental United States, and all administrative
10 expenses reimbursable from other Government agencies:

11 *Provided*, That the distribution of administrative expenses
12 to the accounts of the Association shall be made in accordance
13 with generally recognized accounting principles and practices.

14 ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, LOW RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

15 Administrative expenses of carrying out the provisions
16 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42
17 U.S.C. 1401-1433) shall be provided for from amounts
18 appropriated therefor in this Act, except that necessary
19 expenses of providing representatives at the sites of non-
20 Federal projects in connection with the construction of such
21 projects by public housing agencies with aid under the
22 United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, shall be
23 compensated by such agencies by the payment of fixed fees
24 which in the aggregate will cover the costs of rendering such
25 services, and expenditures for such purpose shall be con-

1 sidered nonadministrative expenses, and funds received from
2 such payments may be used only for the payment of neces-
3 sary expenses of providing such representatives.

4 TITLE ~~III~~ IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

5 SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this
6 Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any cor-
7 poration or agency included in this Act, shall be used for
8 publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or de-
9 feat legislation pending before the Congress.

10 SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in
11 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any
12 corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used to
13 pay the compensation of any employee engaged in person-
14 nel work in excess of the number that would be provided
15 by a ratio of one such employee to one hundred and thirty-
16 five, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent
17 employees of the corporation or agency concerned: *Pro-*
18 *vided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be
19 considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half-
20 time or more in personnel administration consisting of direc-
21 tion and administration of the personnel program; employ-
22 ment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classifi-
23 cation; employee relations and services; wage administra-
24 tion; and processing, recording, and reporting.

25 SEC. 303. Appropriations and funds available for the

1 administrative expenses of the Department of Housing and
2 Urban Development shall be available in the current fiscal
3 year for purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as au-
4 thorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902) ; hire of passenger
5 motor vehicles; and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

6 SEC. 304. Funds made available for the Department of
7 Housing and Urban Development under title ~~H~~ *III* of this
8 Act shall be available, without regard to the limitations on ad-
9 ministrative expenses, for legal services on a contract or fee
10 basis, and for utilizing and making payment for services and
11 facilities of Federal National Mortgage Association, Fed-
12 eral Reserve banks or any member thereof, Federal home-
13 loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the
14 Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended
15 (12 U.S.C. 1811-1831).

16 SEC. 305. None of the funds provided herein shall be
17 used to pay any recipient of a grant for the conduct of a re-
18 search project an amount equal to as much as the entire cost
19 of such project.

20 SEC. 306. No part of any appropriation contained in this
21 Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the cur-
22 rent fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

23 SEC. 307. None of the funds in this Act shall be available
24 to finance interdepartmental boards, commissions, councils,
25 committees, or similar groups under sec. 214 of the Inde-

pendent Offices Appropriation Act, 1936 (31 U.S.C. 691)
which do not have prior and specific Congressional approval
of such method of financial support, *except that during the*
fiscal year 1969, appropriations of interested departments and
agencies shall be available, in aggregate amounts not to exceed
those listed herein, for contributions toward expenses of the
following committees: President's Council on Youth Oppor-
tunity, \$357,000; Interagency Committee on Mexican-Ameri-
can Affairs, \$575,000; U.S.-Mexico Commission on Border
Development and Friendship, \$455,000; National Council
on Indian Opportunity, \$375,000.

SEC. 308. No part of the funds appropriated by this
Act shall be used to pay the salary of any Federal employee
who is *finally* convicted in any Federal, State, or local court
of competent jurisdiction, of inciting, promoting, or carrying
on a riot, ~~or any group activity~~ resulting in material damage
to property or injury to persons, found to be in violation
of Federal, State, or local laws designed to protect persons
or property in the community concerned.

This Act may be cited as the "Independent Offices and
Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropria-
tion Act, 1969".

Passed the House of Representatives May 8, 1968.

Attest:

W. PAT JENNINGS,

Clerk.

90TH CONGRESS
2d Session

H. R. 17023

[Report No. 1375]

AN ACT

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

MAY 10, 1968

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Appropriations

JULY 9, 1968

Reported with amendments

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued July 18, 1968
For actions of July 17, 1968
90th-2nd; No. 123

CONTENTS

AID.....15	Indian affairs.....24	Retirement.....33
Appropriations.....2,20	Legislative program.....20	Safety.....6
Economy.....27	Maritime trades.....14	School lunch.....1,5,35
Farm losses.....18	Navigation.....26	Taxation.....18
Farmers.....28	Oceanography.....8	Technical services.....10
Federal aid.....32	Parking facilities.....22	Timber sales.....16
Foreign affairs.....15	Personnel.....19,33	Vocational education.....1
Foreign trade.....16,17,30	Poultry.....11	Water resources.....21
Forests.....16,31	Poverty.....24	Watersheds.....12
Guam.....13	Public lands.....7	Wheat.....17,34
Health.....6	Reclamation.....21	Wilderness.....23
Housing.....25	Redwood National Park....9	Wildlife.....4
Hunger.....3,29	Research.....8	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee reported school lunch bill. Senate passed vocational education bill with school lunch program amendment. Senate committee voted to report poultry inspection bill. Senate committee reported measure to establish hunger commission. House committee voted to report wilderness bills. Sen. Morse introduced and discussed wheat bill.

SENATE

1. VOCATIONAL EDUCATION. Passed, 88-0, with amendments H. R. 18366, to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (pp. S8799-816, S 8818-29, S8840). Agreed to, 85-0, an amendment by Sen. Javits, modified by agreement to an amendment by Sen. Ellender (pp. S8822-3), to authorize \$50 million for each of fiscal years 1969 and 1970 for school lunch and breakfast programs (pp. S8812-24). Conferees were appointed (p. S8828). S. 3770, a similar bill was indefinitely postponed (p. S8840).

2. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments H. R. 18188, the Transportation Department appropriation bill (S. Rept. 1415). p. S8737
Agreed to conference report on H. R. 18038, the legislative branch appropriation bill (pp. S8830-33). This bill will now be sent to the President.
Began consideration of H. R. 17023, the independent offices and HUD appropriation bill. pp. ~~S8754~~, ~~S8830~~, S8836-7
3. HUNGER. The Labor and Public Welfare Committee reported with amendments S. Res. 281, to establish a Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs (S. Rept. 1416). p. S8737
4. WILDLIFE. The Commerce Committee reported with amendment H. R. 25, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the States, to conduct an inventory and study of the Nation's estuaries and their natural resources (S. Rept. 1419). p. S8737
5. SCHOOL LUNCH. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported an original bill S. 3848, "to amend the National School Lunch Act" (S. Rept. 1428). p. S8738
6. HEALTH; SAFETY. The Commerce Committee reported with amendments H. R. 10790, to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the protection of the public health from radiation emissions from electronic products (S. Rept. 1432). This bill was referred to the Labor and Public Welfare Committee with instructions that it be reported back to the Senate by July 25. p. S8738
7. PUBLIC LANDS. Passed as reported S. 3578, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release, with respect to 72 acres, a condition in a conveyance to the South Carolina State Commission of Forestry requiring the lands to be used for public purposes. pp. S8742-43
8. OCEANOGRAPHY. The Labor and Public Welfare Committee was granted until the close of business Thurs., July 18, to report H. R. 13781, the sea-grant college proposal. p. S8754
9. REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK. Conferees were appointed on S. 2515, to authorize the establishment of the Redwood National Park, Calif. (pp. S8816-7). House conferees have not been appointed.
10. TECHNICAL SERVICES. Concurred in House amendment to S. 3245, to extend for an additional 3 years the authorization of appropriations under the State Technical Services Act of 1965 to make the 1969 authorization \$6.6 million (p. S8830). This bill will now be sent to the President.
11. POULTRY. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) with amendments H. R. 16363, to authorize a more adequate program of poultry inspection in the U. S. p. D695

lic discussion of firearms laws in State, city, and town councils across this Nation.

There are many James Murrays with their bands of marauders traveling about terrorizing officials and the States forcing their own views on the remainder of the public. It is for that reason and that reason alone that 30 years after it was proposed to pass uniform State firearms control laws that there are virtually none on the books.

Every serious attempt to pass such a law is shouted down by the likes of the lobby-led and lobby-inflamed mob that ruled Tuesday in the legislative halls of the State of Connecticut.

James Murray's marauders yesterday were consistent with the tactics of their leaders in the NRA and the gunrunners who have led in this year's long fight against the sane and workable firearms laws which the public demands.

The bad manners and the poor taste of the hooters and catcallers in Connecticut yesterday were not any different than the highly financed and widely distributed and publicly admitted lies spread by the National Rifle Association and its top officers.

Nor are Murray's men any more brazen than the National Rifle Association leaders who sit in a Senate hearing and agree publicly to correct those lies, then immediately forget their promise.

Those who hissed and shouted down anyone who did not agree with them yesterday in Connecticut had the moral leadership of the gunrunners who financed the National Shooting Sports Foundation in its years-long campaign of lies and distortions against strong firearms laws.

The blatant, black, boldfaced lies printed in newspapers across this country were done so at the behest of Charles Dickey, the executive director of the National Shooting Sports Foundation, but everyone of its members are responsible for his actions.

But this is the philosophy and the code of the gunrunners, and it permeates everything they do.

In their own witless belief that they could lie to and manipulate the American people forever, they have used their massive wealth and their hired publicity departments to lie and to twist and to distort the truth in hopes that all of the American people would buy it.

But I believe yesterday in Connecticut this tactic backfired on them. They were caught, fullface, on the television cameras with their hoots, hisses and catcalls.

I would now like to discuss a little more the leader of this pack of storm troopers, Mr. James E. Murray III. Just a few months ago, in a bylined article in the American Rifleman, Murray described the fight he led to water down the Connecticut State firearms law.

He spoke of the "close cooperation between the National Rifle Association, legislators, assorted rifle and pistol clubs."

In his legislative fight the national office of the National Rifle Association was represented by Woodson D. Scott, who is next in line for the presidency of that organization.

In that article in the January 1968 edition of the American Rifleman, James Murray gave this idealized description of the battle these spokesmen for the gunrunners waged:

... It requires hard work and experience to mold an integrated team, but the alternative is the loss of our freedom.

... We stood—and are still standing—shoulder-to-shoulder in the fight for the freedoms that we are obligated to pass on to the next generation.

Hopefully, one of the freedoms of which Mr. Murray spoke was not the freedom of a minority to force mob rule on a public meeting of a legislature.

In that same article Murray pointed out the effectiveness of the Connecticut State Rifle and Revolver Association, a NRA-affiliated club in turning a "bad" gun bill into a "good" gun bill.

Murray crowed that their legislative efforts are well organized and that the importance of this "tightly knit" organization was recognized when it was confronted with a proposed gun law in Connecticut, that was somewhat similar to the law that had been enacted in New Jersey.

Murray indicated:

Time was against us. If certain news media had learned of the pending bill, and had made it a major issue, the battle might have been lost before it had even begun.

He went on to underscore the importance of the fact that because of built-in lines of communication for many years with legislators, staff, and workers, "bills affecting firearms legislation," according to Murray, are reported to a man who is a past president, a past legislative director, and member of the legislative committee of the Connecticut State Rifle and Revolver Association and presently a board member of Ye Connecticut Gun Guild.

If this is not a prime example of just how the National Rifle Association and its affiliated State organizations go about scuttling State gun controls that would be effective, I do not know what is.

In paraphrasing Murray's own words, the key to success is to insure that the news media does not have the opportunity to inform the public of the truth and merits of the issue and then to act quickly to push their own proposals through an uninformed or misinformed legislature.

And so yesterday I appeared before an interim committee of the Connecticut Legislature to present my views on the need for enactment of further gun controls in Connecticut. But this meant that the people of Connecticut might be informed of the facts of gun violence. So, Mr. Murray and his followers, who had packed the State capital, created such a boisterous scene, that it was virtually impossible for me to give my statement.

This is sheer lawlessness.

It is indeed unfortunate when Mr. Murray and his cohorts, in their collective ignorance and bad taste, attempt to "hoot down" a witness, who opposes their view and who does so with objective facts and rationale.

Clearly those who share Mr. Murray's views and who echoed his sentiments in

a loud and clamoring collective voice, having no justification for their position of "guns for everybody" resorted to the only tactics left to them, which are now a matter of public record.

As a result of yesterday's outrageous conduct, I have today written Governor Dempsey asking him to take appropriate steps to have Mr. Murray removed as chairman of the Connecticut State Board of Firearms Permit Examiners.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my letter to Governor Dempsey be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 17, 1968.

HON. JOHN DEMPSEY,
Governor of the State of Connecticut,
Hartford, Conn.

DEAR GOVERNOR DEMPSEY: I am writing to you on a matter of great concern to me and many other people, and which I am sure will be of interest to you.

I was invited to appear before a hearing on gun control legislation before the Interim Judiciary Committee of the Connecticut General Assembly on July 16, 1968.

I invited James V. Bennett, the respected former Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, to accompany me to the hearing and to make a brief statement on the need for sound gun laws. I was greatly shocked to be greeted by repeated jeering, cat calls, and general disorder by a group of five to six hundred people.

This was not in response to anything I said, as it began the minute I approached the microphone to speak.

I found out later that this dreadful and disorderly demonstration was started by James E. Murray, III, who knows of my strong stand on firearms controls and is Chairman of the Connecticut State Board of Firearms Permit Examiners.

As I began my statement, Mr. Murray stood up, walked down the assembly aisle with some of his followers, and shouted wildly and repeatedly, "Close the hearing."

A member of my staff followed Murray into the hallway behind the speakers' podium and entered into a conversation with him.

Murray stated that he had arranged for these people to come from throughout the State of Connecticut who share his fanatic belief that every man should own firearms, unfettered by any State, Federal or local laws.

He freely admitted that he had "packed" the hearing room. He also stated that he had ordered his "pro" gun people to pack the second floor gallery and to sit there all day if need be, so that the gun owners would dominate the meeting.

I am compelled to write to you today and to say in the strongest terms that Mr. Murray is totally unqualified and unfit to remain as the Chairman of the Board of Firearms Permit Examiners.

He has proven by his behavior, not only yesterday but on many previous occasions, to be totally irresponsible, a threat to law and order, and, in fact, emotionally unstable.

He has promoted such outbursts directed at me and my staff on previous occasions, but yesterday's occurrence was by far the most vicious and the most dangerous public performance I can recall in my years of serving the State of Connecticut and the United States Congress.

I feel that as a citizen and as a representative of the State of Connecticut, I have every right to demand his resignation, and I hereby request that, as the Governor of the State of Connecticut, you take the steps to

see that he is removed as Chairman of the Board as soon as possible.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS J. DODD,
U.S. Senator.

INCREASING THE SIZE OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF GALLAUDET COLLEGE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on H.R. 18203.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate H.R. 18203, to increase the size of the board of directors of Gallaudet College, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

CHANGES IN PASSPORT LAWS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 1418.

The assistant legislative clerk laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1418) to make several changes in the passport laws presently in force, which was, on page 2, line 5, strike out "\$13" and insert "\$10".

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, under present law, a passport is valid for a period of 3 years and may be renewed for a further period of 2 years. The passport applicant is required to pay a fee of \$9 for his passport plus an execution fee of \$1 or \$2, depending upon where he applies for the passport. The cost of renewing the passport for an additional 2 years is \$5. Thus, the total cost of a 3-year passport, renewed for an additional 2 years, amounts to \$15 or \$16.

As passed by the Senate, S. 1418 provided for a 5-year passport at a total cost of \$15—\$2 for the execution fee and \$13 for the passport. The House amended the Senate bill to provide for a passport fee of \$10 plus a \$2 execution fee, or a total of \$12. The reasoning behind the House action was that the reduction in workload in providing for a passport of longer validity warranted a reduction in the cost to the traveling public.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1969

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17023) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the De-

partment of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriation bill for 1969, H.R. 17023, as reported, totals \$15,546,552,000 in new obligatory authority, which is \$2,510,401,950 under the appropriations for 1968, \$2,807,165,300 under the estimates for 1969, and an increase of \$1,875,916,000 over the House bill.

In addition, appropriations are included to liquidate contract authority amounting to \$122 million, and contract authorization of \$65 million is included for the rent supplement program.

The largest amount included in the bill for one agency is \$6,977 million to the Veterans' Administration, of which \$4,654 million is for compensation and pensions and \$1,420 million is for medical care.

The next largest amount is for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, \$4,008 million.

Next is the Department of Housing and Urban Development, under title II of the bill, amounting to \$3,060 million, of which \$1 billion is for model cities and \$1,300 million is for advance funding of urban renewal for 1970. Urban renewal appropriations for 1969 were provided in last year's appropriation bill under the advance funding procedure.

After those come the General Services Administration, with \$499 million, and National Science Foundation, with \$410 million.

Of the increase over the House bill, \$1,831 million is in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, largely made up of two items, model cities and urban renewal; and \$44 million is the total of all increases for independent offices.

The housing authorizations for model cities and urban renewal are now pending in conference and were not considered by the House in this appropriation bill. That is the reason for the increase over the House bill. However, the Senate bill as reported is still \$2,807,165,300 under the budget estimates for 1969.

One committee recommendation is over the budget estimate—an increase of \$15 million for grants for basic water and sewer facilities. This is a line item in title II. The total amount of this bill is under the budget.

That is the substance of the bill.

Mr. President, my distinguished colleague from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is here. I want to state for the RECORD that this is the 14th year that I have handled the independent offices appropriation bill as chairman of the subcommittee. It is the 10th year for Senator ALLOTT as the minority leader on the subcommittee. It is the 20th year for Earl Cooper as clerk of the committee. It is the fourth year for Harley Dirks as assistant clerk.

In all those years that we have handled this bill, in a time of economy, I think the figures will prove that we have not just been thinking about economy recently. The net reductions below the budget estimates for these last 14 years have amounted to \$7,708,657,715.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the total amount of the reduction below the present budgetary request?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is \$2,807,165,300 under the budget estimate for 1969.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How much is the appropriation above the House figure?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is \$1,875,916,000.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator stated that time had something to do with the change in the figure.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The new housing bill authorization was not considered by the House in passing this bill. The main additional authorizations the Senate committee provided for are in two items, model cities and urban renewal.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Over the years we have been hoping that somebody would pay some attention to the fact that we scrutinize these requests very carefully. This bill covers some 26 agencies and a department. In that time we have been under the budget request a total of \$7,708,657,715.

Mr. President, we usually ask unanimous consent at this time that the committee amendments to H.R. 17023 be agreed to en bloc; that the bill, as so amended, be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment; and that no points of order will be waived.

I have not presented that request. The Senator from Delaware has asked that we do not do it tonight, because tomorrow some additional amendments will be ready that apply to this appropriation bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have submitted an amendment to the appropriations bill to increase the appropriations under section 701 of the Housing Act. I have discussed it with the chairman. I think he understands. The committee gave the full amount that had been authorized at the time the committee acted on the bill, but in this year's Housing Act we have provided additional coverage for section 701 planning to take place in metropolitan areas, counties, and other areas, and there is no money to take care of that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The committee discussed this matter at great length. The committee finally agreed on the figure contained.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is all that was authorized at that time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I know the Senator from Alabama has a great interest in this matter. We will have to have a roll-call vote on his amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am not asking the Senator for an agreement to take the amendment. The amendment is at the desk. I am not calling it up.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Some members of the committee wanted an increase over the amount reported. The figure in the reported bill was the amount agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me remind the Senator that at the time the appropriation was made, the committee went to the full extent of the authorization, and an additional authorization—

Mr. MAGNUSON. We discussed adding additional funds, subject to new authorization.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I think the RECORD is a little garbled here. At the time the Appropriations Committee passed on the bill, the Senate had passed the authorization bill, so the full amount the Senator is talking about was authorized as far as the Senate Appropriations Committee was concerned.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And we discussed it in marking up this bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will accept that, but there was no provision for the extension of section 701 planning, which this year's bill put in. The money was exactly what was authorized under existing law.

Mr. ALLOTT. I think that is quite true, but I think it is very important to understand that at the time the committee acted upon this bill, the Senate had passed the authorization of which the Senator from Alabama is speaking. Therefore, they were authorized to put that full amount, if we had wished to, in the Senate appropriation bill, subject of course, to final passage by the House. But the Senate committee did consider it and, under the rules of the Senate and the joint administrative practice, we were entitled to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, may I say that the amendment is submitted in behalf of myself, and Senators CLARK, SCOTT, and HATFIELD. I hope tomorrow to present the amendment to the Senate, but I wish to make a statement on it at this time.

My amendment will provide for an appropriation to implement section 701 of the Housing Act which is precisely that requested by the administration. Section 701 of the Housing Act provides for a program of metropolitan and regional planning.

The 701 planning assistance program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development was established in the Housing Act of 1954. In the past, the 701 planning program has been available to cities under 50,000, to counties, to State planning agencies, to councils of governments, and to regional planning commissions. Last year's appropriation for 701 was \$45 million. The amount proposed in the current appropriations bill before this body today is \$38.8 million, a reduction of \$6 million. The administration requested \$55 million for the 701 planning assistance program this year.

The 701 planning assistance program has become the only funding source encouraging comprehensive planning for cities, counties, States, and metropolitan areas. The planning under 701 has not only included the development of plans for physical facilities but, increasingly, programs for coordination and implementation of planning efforts. Within the last 2 years 701 funding has substantially assisted the planning efforts of the States and our metropolitan areas. With the growing number of Federal grant programs, this planning is crucial so that States, local governments, and more importantly, the Federal Government will

spend their dollars for public works and other projects which are coordinated and consistent with a logical plan for growth and development.

First. The demand from the groups presently funded under 701 amounted to more than \$75 million last year, which is almost double our proposed appropriation. The peak in this demand is not fully known even today because of the tremendous growth in the number of regional councils in metropolitan and rural areas and State planning operations. Since the beginning of 1966 there have been more than 75 new regional councils created which are eligible for 701 planning assistance. There is no reason to suspect at this time that this rapid growth in the creation of these new cooperative endeavors will subside in the near future, consequently placing even greater demands on the limited resources available for planning assistance.

Second. Besides the growth in demand of presently eligible agencies for 701 planning, the Housing Act of 1968, which we recently approved, makes four new groups eligible for 701 planning assistance. These groups are first, multicounty nonmetropolitan area cooperative agencies; second, multistate regional commissions; third, economic development districts of the Economic Development Administration; and, fourth, cities over 50,000 population. It is conservatively estimated that these new groups will require \$50 million in funding this year alone. Of particular interest is the fact that 701 planning assistance will not be available to nonmetropolitan area groups, such as councils of governments, for planning and coordination. If the appropriation is not increased from \$38.8 million, there will be no funds available to get these essential endeavors underway. I urge that the appropriation for 701 planning assistance be increased to \$55 million, which is the amount recommended by the Administration.

At the time the bill was passed by the House and at the time it was reported by the Appropriations Committee here in the Senate, the remaining unused authorization was only \$38,838,000, and the amount provided in the House bill and the amount recommended by the Senate committee was set at that figure. Of course, at that time no one knew whether or not the authorization would be increased. At this point, however, we know that both the Senate and the House versions of S. 3497, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, provide for an increase in the authorization for the section 701 program to \$265 million, which is more than adequate to cover the \$55 million appropriation recommended by the administration.

Mr. President, the 701 planning program provides not only for urban planning but provides for regional planning which is of tremendous assistance to rural areas which are developing or which desire to develop. This program can make a significant contribution toward curbing the out migration of rural people to our cities. I know that I need not go into detail regarding the problem which this out migration is presenting to our Nation today. I urge the Senate to provide for an appropriation

in the amount requested by the Administration, which is what my amendment will do.

JAVITS CALLS FOR AN ACTION PROGRAM TO BRING ABOUT MIDDLE EAST PEACE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to address some remarks to the Senate on the situation in the Middle East, immediately following the visit of President Nasser of the United Arab Republic to Moscow.

It is essential that the world not be misled by President Nasser's disappointment with the results of his most recent pilgrimage to Moscow. For it is clear that he is engaged in an ambitious and dangerous political offensive aimed at enabling him to repeat his accomplishments of 1957—winning the peace after losing the war. For President Nasser seems to have learned nothing and forgotten nothing.

The Moscow trip—with its vague talk of "further joint steps" in the Arab-Israeli conflict; with its coy intimation that Israel may get transit for cargoes on the Suez Canal, and with talk of feelers to see what Israel would consider "secure boundaries" in accordance with the Security Council's November 22 resolution—represent salami tactics designed to cut away at the real issue. The issue is whether or not President Nasser really means to get a Middle East peace.

There is no indication that the Egyptian President has experienced a change of heart since June of 1967. Therefore, the continuing openly expressed Arab intention of preparing for "another round"—one in which they hope to bring down Israel and annihilate its people—must therefore still be considered by the world to remain valid.

The people of Israel certainly prefer peace to war; peace means survival to them. But the bitter lesson of 1957 taught the Israelis that paper promises are no guarantee of peace and provide no substitute for resolute self-defense as a means of deterring war.

In the weeks preceding the 6-day June war, it was the Arabs who reminded the world in shrill tones that a state of belligerency between the Arabs and Israeli has never ended and that armistices and ceasefires fail to alter the "right" of the Arabs to pursue their belligerency through acts of war, at times and places of their own choosing.

This historical lesson is pertinent today because the United States played a key role in persuading Israel to accept the Jerry-built arrangement of 1957 which collapsed at a crucial moment a decade later. The grave defects of the 1957 arrangement are clear. First, the Arabs agreed to nothing which was binding from their view. Second, the United States offered "assurances" to Israel, in return for Israel's withdrawal from the Sinai which this nation was later unable to fulfill.

The United States was unable to fulfill its assurances in 1967 not because we were guilty of bad faith, but because our own security situation had changed radically from what it was when these assurances were first given. A decade

later, the United States was deeply involved in the quicksand of Vietnam. A decade later, the U.S. 6th Fleet no longer held unchallenged sway over the Mediterranean, as we found ourselves maneuvering eyeball to eyeball with a powerful Soviet flotilla.

This revised Middle East power structure, which involves an open confrontation between American and Soviet nuclear-armed forces, is what makes the need for a lasting and durable peace in the Middle East so important, not only to the nations of the area, but to the whole world. Without such a real peace, a peace with clearly defined enforcement procedures, there is every danger that a renewal of the fighting could quickly involve the world's two nuclear superpowers.

The present situation is unsatisfactory. Hardly a day goes by without fresh reports of Arab terrorist raids behind Israeli lines or of firing across the cease-fire lines. Yet, bad as it is, the present situation is far preferable to again having to pull President Nasser's chestnuts out of the Middle East fire as we had to do in 1957, and as he is trying to make us do now. Nasser's trip to Moscow was preceded by hints of Egyptian peacefulness and the desire to be reasonable. Semiofficial sources in Cairo let it be known that Egypt might be willing to accept United Nations peace-keeping forces back in the Sinai if the Israelis agreed to withdraw, though it was the Egyptians themselves who had ordered that force out, when it thought the result would be a sweep of its Soviet-equipped army over Israel in June of 1967. Indeed, there were hints that such a prior Israeli withdrawal might even be rewarded with eventual permission from Cairo to allow Israeli cargo to move its cargoes through the Suez Canal.

The Egyptian Foreign Minister implied, in a cryptic sentence to a reporter in Copenhagen, that the Arabs had been mistaken in failing to acknowledge the reality of Israel's existence. But this final gambit predictably brought an immediate protest from militant Arab circles and Cairo promptly let it be known that the Foreign Minister had been misquoted. How does one deal with this smokescreen of words which hint at something and promise nothing?

In my judgment, it is essential that we in the United States, especially, keep cool. This will require steady nerves. Yet there are some indications that such patience and resolution will pay off. Premier Kosygin's recent indication that his government is interested in an arms limitation agreement in the Middle East suggests that the Arabs may at last see that their dreams of revenge and military conquest have reached the end of the line.

I ask unanimous consent that a press report from Geneva dated July 16, 1968, reporting that the Soviet delegate to the disarmament conference indicated the U.S.S.R.'s conditional interest in an agreement on limitation of shipments of arms to the Middle East, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. JAVITS. The apparent failure of President Nasser and his military commanders to extract any significant new military aid from Moscow suggests the same thing.

It must be demonstrated to Arab militants that the world will no longer accept a false peace in the Middle East.

In that connection, Mr. President, we have received today news of a military coup against the Iraq Government. The Baghdad radio reports that one of the complaints of the new council is of the old regime's alleged "prevention of the Iraq Army from facing the Israelis during the June war and covering up for imperialists and Zionist espionage rings."

If that is what the Aref regime is being accused of, Mr. President, when, as I say, it was one of the most fanatical and anti-Israel governments in the whole Middle East, we can understand very clearly how difficult it is to deal with the Arab militants and how important it is to keep cool, and not jump at the bait until something is really going to happen with respect to a permanent peace. Once the Arab militants see that the world will not accept a false peace, perhaps they will finally sit down with the Israelis to hammer out a viable peace settlement—one which will be a boon to all the people of that beleaguered area.

I have no doubt that when that day comes—the day that the Arabs show a plain readiness to talk plainly—that they will find Israel steadfast in pursuit of peace, but not hard or vindictive in her terms, notwithstanding her great victory in June 1967.

Until that day comes, the United States must demonstrate to Egypt and the Soviet Union, by maintaining the arms balance and by other means, that this Nation will not be induced by hints of Arab reasonableness—such as we have recently heard and which sound like an echo of the false siren songs of 1957–58 and without the substance of a mutually offered peace settlement—to pressure Israel to withdraw from the territories it holds. The Israelis should not do so before the Arabs sit down and work out a durable peace—yet this is clearly the main hope and premise of Cairo's current "peace offensive."

It is most revealing that at the very time President Nasser was in Moscow, Cairo played host to a meeting of the two rival Arab terrorist organizations, the Palestine Liberation Organization and Al Fatah. According to press reports, close coordination of the guerrilla efforts of the PLO and Al Fatah was agreed upon—signaling an escalation of Arab terrorism behind Israel's lines. This problem may prove to be too urgent and too incendiary to await a final peace treaty, and perhaps should be the subject of immediate United Nations action. Earlier, I supported Ambassador Goldberg's call in the Security Council for the positioning of United Nations Observers along the banks of the Jordan River. I urge that this proposal be given urgent consideration now, in light of the

joint action proposals of the PLO and Al Fatah, and the increased threat to peace which this step represents.

We need a U.S. policy that is more viable and consistent—compatible alike with our security, experience and with the achievement of a lasting peace in the Middle East. It is consistent also with the six points issued by Vice President HUMPHREY, on July 11, 1968. But this is an action program and that is what we need today.

The statement of objectives put out by the Vice President is fine. But we need to do more to attain these objectives. For the unresolved Arab-Israeli conflict also serves as a hot spark that could at any time enflame relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. In 1 day all that we are doing to arrive at a general understanding with the Soviet Union could be undone by a renewal of war in the Middle East.

I suggest that the United States adopt the following five-point policy:

I. NEW SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION

The Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967 does, in my judgment, represent a suitable basis for negotiations between Israel and the Arab States. However, if—as now seems likely—this resolution proves inadequate to the task of getting real negotiations started among the nations involved, stronger inducements must be considered by the international community. The United States and the Soviet Union have the prime responsibility in this regard. Together they should jointly sponsor a new Security Council resolution which specifically addresses itself to the way in which negotiations are to be carried on to implement the resolution of November 22, and, therefore, would get over the hurdle of the refusal of the parties to talk to each other or even to talk to each other through Ambassador Jarring.

II. MIDDLE EAST ARMS CONTROL AGREEMENT

The rising level of renewed violence in the Middle East gives new urgency to the need for a viable agreement to limit the supply of arms from outside the area. The possession of sophisticated weapons by irresponsible States feeds the flames of violence, and violence in turn stimulates the search for sources of arms supply. This vicious and highly volatile cycle needs to be broken. It is an urgent area for United States-U.S.S.R. initiative and cooperation. The United States-Soviet agreement on a nonproliferation treaty suggests that there may be a new opening for agreement on the control of arms supply to the Middle East.

If the Soviet Union continues to be unwilling to reach an agreement on limiting the supply of arms to the Middle East—indeed, until such time as a workable agreement is actually reached—it will be essential for the United States to assure that there is an arms balance by providing Israel with such sophisticated military equipment as is needed for its security and which it cannot obtain elsewhere.

The new buildup of sophisticated Soviet weaponry in Arab hands indicates that the time for the granting of the

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued July 19, 1968
For actions of July 18, 1968
90th-2nd; No. 124

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....7,18	Highways.....10	Redwood Park.....21
Census.....44	Hunger.....28	Research.....2,12
Community development...37	Indian affairs.....22	Rural America.26,29,35,37
Cotton.....16	Land.....45	Tariffs.....39
Education.....32	Legislative program....16	Taxation.....33
Employment.....25,35	Metric system.....4	Trade fairs.....3
Extension service.....30	Oceanography.....2	Transportation.....9
Farm income.....40	Organization.....14,41	User charges.....39
Farm program.....1,31,42	Peanuts.....40	U. S.-Mexico.....15
Federal aid.....36	Personnel.....38	Water resources.....6,34
Fish protein.....20	Pollution.....24	Watersheds.....19
Flood control.....5	Postal service.....11	Wheat.....42
Foreign aid.....17,23	Poverty.....22,26	Wildlife.....27
Foreign trade.....13	Recreation.....8,21	Youth corps.....43

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate debated farm bill. House passed foreign aid authorization bill.

SENATE

1. FARM PROGRAM. Began consideration of S. 3590, to extend and improve legislation for maintaining farm income, stabilizing prices and assuring adequate supplies of agricultural commodities (pp. S8939-44). Sen. Ellender said this is a simple 4-year extension of the Food and Agriculture Act, with some minor changes and asked the Senate to approve this legislation without delay. pp. S8939-44

2. OCEANOGRAPHY. The Labor and Public Welfare Committee reported with amendments H. R. 13781, authorizing funds for sea-grant colleges and ocean exploration (S. Rept. 1439). p. S8845
3. TRADE FAIRS. The Commerce Committee reported without amendment H. R. 18340, to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide for continuation of authority to develop American flag carriers and promote the foreign commerce of the U. S. through the use of mobile trade fairs (S. Rept. 1441). p. S8845
4. METRIC SYSTEM. The Commerce Committee reported with amendment H. R. 3136, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make a study to determine the advantages and disadvantages of increased use of the metric system in the United States (S. Rept. 1442). p. S8845
5. FLOOD CONTROL. Conferees were appointed on S. 3710, to authorize the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control (pp. S8864-70). House conferees have not been appointed.
6. WATER RESOURCES. Sen. Fannin was appointed as a conferee on S. 20, to provide for a comprehensive review of national water resource problems and programs, in place of Sen. Allot who asked to be excused from serving. p. S8921

7. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed with amendments H. R. 17023, the independent offices and HUD appropriation bill (pp. S8909-38). Conferees were appointed for the Senate (p. S8938). House conferees have not been appointed.

Sen. Bennett urged approval of the Bonneville unit of the central Utah public works project included in the public works appropriation bill. pp. S8889-90

8. RECREATION. Sen. Gruening discussed the need for additional visitor facilities in Alaska's Glacier Bay National Monument area. pp. S8878-9
9. TRADE. The Commerce Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 927, to make unlawful certain discriminatory property tax assessments of common carrier property (amended). p. D702
10. HIGHWAYS. Sen. Monroney commended the inclusion in the highway authorization bill of the provision to prohibit the construction of any toll highway on the Interstate Highway System after June 30, 1968, unless the Secretary of Transportation makes an affirmative finding that a toll facility rather than a free facility is in the public interest. pp. S8855-6
11. MAIL. Sen. Monroney expressed concern over the requirement in the tax bill that the Post Office begin to reduce employment, stating "the Post Office cannot continue all services at their present level, and also absorb an increase in mail volume, with fewer employees to do the work." pp. S8856-7
Sen. Brewster supported legislation exempting the Post Office Department from the requirement to reduce employment. p. S8889

90TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 17023

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 18, 1968

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

AN ACT

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for sundry inde-
5 pendent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corpora-
6 tions, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing
7 and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June
8 30, 1969, and for other purposes, namely:

1 TITLE I

2 EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

3 NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL

4 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5 For expenses necessary for the National Aeronautics and
6 Space Council, established by section 201 of the National
7 Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C.
8 2471), including hire of passenger motor vehicles, reimburse-
9 ment of the General Services Administration for security
10 guard services, and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109,
11 \$500,000.

12 OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING

13 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

14 For expenses necessary for the Office of Emergency
15 Planning, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109,
16 reimbursement of the General Services Administration for
17 security guard services, hire of passenger motor vehicles, and
18 expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and individuals
19 at meetings concerned with the work of emergency planning,
20 \$4,850,000.

21 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, TELECOMMUNICATIONS

22 For expenses necessary for the conduct of telecommuni-
23 cations functions assigned to the Director of Telecommunica-
24 tions Management, including services as authorized by 5

1 U.S.C. 3109, \$1,675,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed
 2 \$500,000 of the foregoing amount shall remain available for
 3 telecommunications studies and research until expended.

4 CIVIL DEFENSE AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION FUNCTIONS
 5 OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

6 For expenses necessary to assist other Federal agencies
 7 to perform civil defense and defense mobilization functions,
 8 including payments by the Department of Labor to
 9 State employment security agencies for the full cost of admin-
 10 istration of defense manpower mobilization activities,
 11 \$3,100,000.

12 OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
 13 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

14 For expenses necessary for the Office of Science and
 15 Technology, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C.
 16 3109, ~~(1)\$1,750,000~~ \$1,850,000.

17 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

18 APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

19 For expenses necessary to carry out the programs au-
 20 thorized by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of
 21 1965, as amended, except expenses authorized by section
 22 105 of said Act, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C.
 23 3109, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, ~~(2)\$168,600,-~~
 24 ~~000~~ \$178,600,000, to remain available until expended.

DISASTER RELIEF

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1855-1855g) and section 9 of the Disaster Relief Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-769), authorizing assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, ~~(3)\$5,000,000~~ \$15,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed 3 per centum of the foregoing amount shall be available for administrative expenses.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Cochairman and his alternate on the Appalachian Regional Commission and for payment of the Federal share of the administrative expenses of the Commission, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$850,000.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board, including hire of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902);

1 and not to exceed \$1,000 for official reception and repre-
2 sentation expenses, \$9,350,000.

3 PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS (LIQUIDATION OF
4 CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

5 For payments to air carriers of so much of the compen-
6 sation fixed and determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board
7 under section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49
8 U.S.C. 1376), as is payable by the Board, \$45,000,000, to
9 remain available until expended.

10 CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

11 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

12 For necessary expenses, including services as authorized
13 by 5 U.S.C. 3109; not to exceed \$10,000 for medical exam-
14 inations performed for veterans by private physicians on a
15 fee basis; payment in advance for library membership in
16 societies whose publications are available to members only or
17 to members at a price lower than to the general public; not to
18 exceed \$161,000 for performing the duties imposed upon the
19 Commission by chapter 15 of title 5, United States Code; and
20 not to exceed \$1,000 for official reception and representation
21 expenses; ~~(4)\$37,000,000~~ \$37,564,000, including funding
22 of Interagency Boards of Examiners, together with not to ex-
23 ceed \$6,460,000 for necessary expenses incurred during the
24 current fiscal year in the administration of the retirement and

1 insurance programs, to be transferred from the trust funds
2 "Civil Service retirement and disability fund", "Employees
3 life insurance fund", "Employees health benefits fund", and
4 "Retired employees health benefits fund", in such amounts as
5 may be determined by the Civil Service Commission, with-
6 out regard to the provisions of any other Act, but this pro-
7 vision shall not affect the authority of 5 U.S.C. 8348 (a) and
8 section 1 (b) of Public Law 89-205 (79 Stat. 840), pro-
9 viding for additional administrative expenses to effect an-
10 nuity adjustments under 5 U.S.C. 8340, section 1 (c) of
11 Public Law 89-205 (79 Stat. 840) and section 1 of
12 Public Law 89-314 (79 Stat. 1162): *Provided*, That
13 \$700,000 of this appropriation shall be available to carry
14 out the provisions of Executive Order 10422 of January 9,
15 1953, as amended, prescribing procedures for making avail-
16 able to the Secretary General of the United Nations, and the
17 executive heads of other international organizations, certain
18 information concerning United States citizens employed, or
19 being considered for employment by such organizations, in-
20 cluding advances or reimbursements to the applicable appro-
21 priations or funds of the Civil Service Commission and the
22 Federal Bureau of Investigation for expenses incurred by
23 such agencies under said Executive Order: *Provided further*,
24 That members of the International Organizations Employees

1 Loyalty Board may be paid actual transportation expenses,
2 and per diem in lieu of subsistence under 5 U.S.C. 5702,
3 while traveling on official business away from their homes or
4 regular places of business, including periods while en route
5 to and from and at the place where their services are to be
6 performed.

7 No part of the appropriations herein made to the Civil
8 Service Commission shall be available for the salaries and
9 expenses of the Legal Examining Unit in the Examining and
10 Personnel Utilization Division of the Commission, established
11 pursuant to Executive Order 9358 of July 1, 1943.

12 ANNUITIES UNDER SPECIAL ACTS

13 For payment of annuities authorized by the Act of
14 May 29, 1944, as amended (48 U.S.C. 1373a), and the Act
15 of August 19, 1950, as amended (33 U.S.C. 771-775),
16 \$1,350,000.

17 GOVERNMENT PAYMENT FOR ANNUITANTS, EMPLOYEES

18 HEALTH BENEFITS

19 For payment of Government contributions with respect
20 to retired employees, as authorized by chapter 89 of title 5,
21 United States Code, and the Retired Federal Employees
22 Health Benefits Act (74 Stat. 849), as amended, \$40,-
23 748,000, to remain available until expended.

1 PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND
2 DISABILITY FUND

3 For financing the estimated cost of new and increased
4 annuity benefits, during the current fiscal year, as provided
5 by part III of Public Law 87-793 (76 Stat. 868), \$72,000,-
6 000, to be credited to the civil service retirement and dis-
7 ability fund.

8 **(5)** COMMISSION ON EXECUTIVE, LEGISLATIVE, AND
9 JUDICIAL SALARIES
10 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

11 *For necessary expenses of the Commission on Executive,*
12 *Legislative, and Judicial Salaries, authorized by section*
13 *225 of the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of*
14 *1967 (81 Stat. 642-645), \$100,000.*

15 FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
16 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

17 For necessary expenses in performing the duties of the
18 Commission as authorized by law, including uniforms or al-
19 lowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-
20 5902) ; not to exceed \$41,000 for land and structures; not
21 to exceed \$11,000 for improvement and care of grounds and
22 repairs to buildings; not to exceed \$500 for official reception
23 and representation expenses; special counsel fees; services
24 as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; and purchase of one passen-
25 ger motor vehicle for replacement only, ~~(6)~~\$19,750,000
26 \$20,000,000.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the work of the Commission, as authorized by law, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and not to exceed \$500 for official reception and representation expenses, ~~(7)\$15,000,000~~ \$15,200,000.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commission, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902), and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$16,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be expended upon any investigation hereafter provided by concurrent resolution of the Congress until funds are appropriated subsequently to the enactment of such resolution to finance the cost of such investigation.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

OPERATING EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of real property management and related activities as provided by law; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia; restoration of leased premises; moving Government agencies (including space adjustments) in connection

1 with the assignment, allocation, and transfer of building
2 space; acquisition by purchase or otherwise of real estate and
3 interests therein; and contractual services incident to clean-
4 ing or servicing buildings and moving; ~~(8)\$271,881,000~~
5 \$276,763,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be
6 available to provide such fencing, lighting, guard booths,
7 and other facilities on private or other property not in Gov-
8 ernment ownership or control as may be appropriate to
9 enable the United States Secret Service to perform its pro-
10 tective functions pursuant to title 18, U.S.C. 3056.

11 REPAIR AND IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

12 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to
13 alter public buildings and to acquire additions to sites pursu-
14 ant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479) and
15 to alter other Federally-owned buildings and to acquire
16 additions to sites thereof, including grounds, approaches and
17 appurtenances, wharves and piers, together with the neces-
18 sary dredging adjacent thereto; and care and safeguarding of
19 sites; preliminary planning of projects by contract or other-
20 wise; maintenance, preservation, demolition, and equipment:
21 \$80,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*.
22 That for the purposes of this appropriation, buildings con-
23 structed pursuant to the Public Buildings Purchase Contract
24 Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356) and the Post Office Depart-
25 ment Property Act of 1954 (39 U.S.C. 2104 et seq.), and

1 buildings under the control of another department or agency
2 where alteration of such buildings is required in connection
3 with the moving of such other department or agency from
4 buildings then, or thereafter to be, under the control of Gen-
5 eral Services Administration shall be considered to be public
6 buildings.

7 SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

8 For an additional amount for expenses necessary in
9 connection with the construction of public buildings projects
10 not otherwise provided for, as specified under this head in
11 the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts of 1959 and
12 1960, including preliminary planning of public buildings
13 projects by contract or otherwise, \$10,995,000, to remain
14 available until expended.

15 PAYMENTS, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PURCHASE CONTRACTS

16 For payments of principal, interest, taxes, and any other
17 obligations under contracts entered into pursuant to the
18 Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C.
19 356), \$2,400,000.

20 EXPENSES, UNITED STATES COURT FACILITIES

21 For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, to
22 provide directly or indirectly, additional space for the United
23 States Courts incident to expansion of facilities (including
24 rental of buildings in the District of Columbia and elsewhere

1 and moving and space adjustments), and furniture and tur-
2 nishings, \$750,000.

3 OPERATING EXPENSES, FEDERAL SUPPLY SERVICE

4 For expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary for sup-
5 ply distribution, procurement, inspection, operation of the
6 stores depot system (including contractual services incident
7 to receiving, handling, and shipping warehouse items), and
8 other supply management and related activities, as authorized
9 by law, \$72,500,000. .

10 OPERATING EXPENSES, NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND

11 RECORDS SERVICE

12 For necessary expenses in connection with Federal
13 records management and related activities, as provided by
14 law, including reimbursement for security guard services,
15 and contractual services incident to movement or disposal of
16 records, \$18,300,000.

17 NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS GRANTS

18 For allocation to Federal agencies, and for grants to
19 State and local agencies and nonprofit organizations and in-
20 stitutions, for the collecting, describing, preserving and com-
21 piling, and publishing of documentary sources significant to
22 the history of the United States, \$350,000, to remain avail-
23 able until expended.

1 OPERATING EXPENSES, TRANSPORTATION AND

2 COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE

3 For necessary expenses of transportation, communica-
4 tions, and other public utilities management and related
5 activities, as provided by law, including services as author-
6 ized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$6,150,000.

7 OPERATING EXPENSES, PROPERTY MANAGEMENT AND

8 DISPOSAL SERVICE

9 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary
10 for carrying out the functions of the Administrator with
11 respect to the utilization of excess property; the disposal
12 of surplus property; the rehabilitation of personal property;
13 the appraisal of real and personal property; the national
14 stockpile established by the Strategic and Critical Materials
15 Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98-98h) ; the supplemental
16 stockpile established by section 104 (b) of the Agricultural
17 Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat.
18 456, as amended by 73 Stat. 607) ; the national industrial
19 reserve established by the National Industrial Reserve Act
20 of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451-462) ; including services as
21 authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and reimbursement for
22 security guard services, \$28,500,000, to be derived from
23 proceeds from transfers of excess property, disposal of surplus

1 property, and sales of stockpile materials: *Provided*, That
2 during the current fiscal year the General Services Adminis-
3 tration is authorized to acquire leasehold interests in prop-
4 erty, for periods not in excess of twenty years, for the
5 storage, security, and maintenance of strategic, critical, and
6 other materials in the national and supplemental stockpiles
7 provided said leasehold interests are at nominal cost to the
8 Government: *Provided further*, That during the current
9 fiscal year there shall be no limitation on the value of surplus
10 strategic and critical materials which, in accordance with
11 section 6 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling
12 Act (50 U.S.C. 98e), may be transferred without reim-
13 bursement to the national stockpile: *Provided further*, That
14 during the current fiscal year materials in the inventory
15 maintained under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as
16 amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2061-2166), and excess ma-
17 terials in the national stockpile and the supplemental stock-
18 pile, the disposition of which is authorized by law, shall be
19 available, without reimbursement, for transfer at fair market
20 value to contractors as payment for expenses (including
21 transportation and other accessorial expenses) of acquisition
22 of materials, or of refining, processing, or otherwise bene-
23 ficiating materials, or of rotating materials, pursuant to sec-
24 tion 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling
25 Act (50 U.S.C. 98b), and of processing and refining ma-

1 materials pursuant to section 303 (d) of the Defense Production
2 Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2093 (d)).

3 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

4 For expenses of executive direction for activities under
5 the control of the General Services Administration, \$1,820,-
6 000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$500 shall be available
7 for reception and representation expenses.

8 ALLOWANCES AND OFFICE FACILITIES FOR FORMER
9 PRESIDENTS

10 For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August
11 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 838), \$267,000: *Provided*, That the
12 Administrator of General Services shall transfer to the Secre-
13 tary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to carry
14 out the provisions of sections (a) and (e) of such Act.

15 EXPENSES, PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION

16 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the
17 Presidential Transition Act of 1963 (3 U.S.C. 102, note),
18 \$900,000, to remain available until June 30, 1970.

19 ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS FUND

Funds available to General Services Administration for administrative operations, in support of program activities, shall be expended and accounted for, as a whole, through a single fund: *Provided*, That costs and obligations for such administrative operations for the respective program activities shall be accounted for in accordance with systems ap-

1 proved by the General Accounting Office: *Provided further,*
2 That the total amount deposited into said account for the cur-
3 rent fiscal year from funds made available to General Services
4 Administration in this Act shall not exceed \$13,700,000:
5 *Provided further,* That amounts deposited into said account
6 for administrative operations for each program shall not
7 exceed the amounts included in the respective program
8 appropriations for such purposes.

9 GENERAL PROVISIONS

10 The appropriate appropriation or fund available to the
11 General Services Administration shall be credited with (1)
12 cost of operation, protection, maintenance, upkeep, repair,
13 and improvement, included as part of rentals received from
14 Government corporations pursuant to law (40 U.S.C. 129) ;
15 (2) reimbursements for services performed in respect to
16 bonds and other obligations under the jurisdiction of the
17 General Services Administration, issued by public authori-
18 ties, States, or other public bodies, and such services in re-
19 spect to such bonds or obligations as the Administrator
20 deems necessary and in the public interest may, upon the
21 request and at the expense of the issuing agencies, be pro-
22 vided from the appropriate foregoing appropriation; and
23 (3) appropriations or funds available to other agencies, and
24 transferred to the General Services Administration, in con-
25 nection with property transferred to the General Services

1 Administration pursuant to the Act of July 2, 1948 (50
2 U.S.C. 451ff), and such appropriations or funds may be so
3 transferred, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

4 Appropriations to the General Services Administration
5 under the heading "Construction, Public Buildings Projects"
6 shall be available, subject to the provisions of the Public
7 Buildings Act of 1959 for (1) acquisition of buildings and
8 sites thereof by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, in-
9 cluding prepayment of purchase contracts, (2) extension or
10 conversion of Government-owned buildings, and (3) con-
11 struction of new buildings, in addition to those set forth under
12 that appropriation: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall
13 authorize an expenditure of funds for acquisition, extension or
14 conversion, or construction without the approval of the Com-
15 mittees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of
16 Representatives.

17 Funds available to the General Services Administration
18 shall be available for the hire of passenger motor vehicles.

19 No part of any money appropriated by this or any
20 other Act for any agency of the executive branch of the
21 Government shall be used during the current fiscal year for
22 the purchase within the continental limits of the United
23 States of any typewriting machines except in accordance
24 with regulations issued pursuant to the provisions of the

1 Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949,
2 as amended.

3 Not to exceed 2 per centum of any appropriation made
4 available to the General Services Administration for the
5 current fiscal year by this Act may be transferred to any
6 other such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be
7 increased thereby more than 2 per centum: *Provided*, That
8 such transfers shall apply only to operating expenses, and
9 shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount of \$2,000,000.

10 Appropriations available to any department or agency
11 during the current fiscal year for necessary expenses, includ-
12 ing maintenance or operating expenses, shall also be available
13 for (a) reimbursement to the General Services Administra-
14 tion for those expenses of renovation and alteration of build-
15 ings and facilities which constitute public improvements, per-
16 formed in accordance with the Public Buildings Act of 1959
17 (73 Stat. 479) or other applicable law, and (b) transfer or
18 reimbursement to applicable appropriations to said Adminis-
19 tration for rents and related expenses, not otherwise provided
20 for, of providing subject to Executive Order 11035, dated
21 July 9, 1962, directly or indirectly, suitable general purpose
22 space for any such department or agency, in the District of
23 Columbia or elsewhere.

24 No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall
25 be used for the payment of rental on lease agreements for the
26 accommodation of Federal agencies in buildings and improve-

1 ments which are to be erected by the lessor for such agencies
2 at an estimated cost of construction in excess of \$200,000 or
3 for the payment of the salary of any person who executes
4 such a lease agreement: *Provided*, That the foregoing proviso
5 shall not be applicable to projects for which a prospectus for
6 the lease construction of space has been submitted to the Con-
7 gress and approval made in the same manner as for the
8 public buildings construction projects pursuant to the Public
9 Buildings Act of 1959.

10 INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

11 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

12 For necessary expenses of the Interstate Commerce
13 Commission, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C.
14 3109, \$23,846,000(9), of which \$150,000 shall be available
15 for valuation of pipelines: *Provided*, That Joint Board mem-
16 bers and cooperating State commissioners may use Govern-
17 ment transportation requests when traveling in connection
18 with their duties as such.

19 NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE

20 ADMINISTRATION

21 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

22 For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for,
23 including research, development, operations, services, minor
24 construction, supplies, materials, equipment; maintenance, re-
25 pair, and alteration of real and personal property; and pur-

1 chase, hire, maintenance, and operation of other than admin-
 2 istrative aircraft necessary for the conduct and support of
 3 aeronautical and space research and development activities
 4 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration,
 5 (10)~~\$3,383,250,000~~ \$3,370,300,000, to remain available
 6 until expended.

7 CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

8 For advance planning, design, and construction of facili-
 9 ties for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration,
 10 and for the acquisition or condemnation of real property, as
 11 authorized by law, (11)~~\$21,800,000~~ \$34,750,000, to remain
 12 available until expended.

13 ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS

14 For necessary expenses of operation of the National
 15 Aeronautics and Space Administration, not otherwise pro-
 16 vided for, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as au-
 17 thorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902) : minor construc-
 18 tion; supplies, materials, services, and equipment; awards;
 19 hire, maintenance and operation of administrative aircraft;
 20 purchase (not to exceed ten for replacement only) and hire
 21 of passenger motor vehicles; and maintenance, repair, and
 22 alteration of real and personal property; \$603,173,000: *Pro-*
 23 *vided*, That contracts may be entered into under this appro-
 24 priation for maintenance and operation of facilities, and for
 25 other services, to be provided during the next fiscal year.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act may be transferred to any other such appropriation.

Not to exceed \$35,000 of the appropriation "Administrative Operations" in this Act for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be available for scientific consultations or extraordinary expense, to be expended upon the approval or authority of the Administrator and his determination shall be final and conclusive.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861-1875) Title IX of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (42 U.S.C. 1876-1879), the National Sea Grant Colleges and Program Act of 1966 (80 Stat. 998), and the Act to establish a National Medal of Science (42 U.S.C. 1880-1881), including award of graduate fellowships; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; ~~(12)~~purchase of one aircraft; maintenance and operation of ~~(13)~~three four aircraft and purchase of flight services for research support; hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed \$2,500 for official reception and representation ex-

1 penses; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law
 2 (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902) ; rental of conference rooms in the
 3 District of Columbia; and reimbursement of the General
 4 Services Administration for security guard services;
 5 ~~(14)~~\$400,000,000, \$410,000,000, to remain available until
 6 expended: *Provided*, That of the foregoing amount not less
 7 than \$37,600,000 shall be available for tuition, grants, and
 8 allowances in connection with a program of supplementary
 9 training for secondary school science and mathematics
 10 teachers: *Provided further*, That receipts for scientific sup-
 11 port services and materials furnished by the National Re-
 12 search Centers may be credited to this appropria-
 13 tion~~(15)~~: ~~And provided further~~, That no part of this ap-
 14 propriation shall be available for or paid out to the bene-
 15 fit of any individual who at any time after the effective
 16 date of this Act, willfully refuses to obey a lawful regula-
 17 tion of the university or college which he is attending or at
 18 which he is employed: : *And provided further*, That if an
 19 institution of higher education receiving funds hereunder
 20 determines after affording notice and opportunity for hear-
 21 ing to an individual attending, or employed by, such institu-
 22 tion, that such individual has, after the date of enactment
 23 of this Act, willfully refused to obey a lawful regulation
 24 or order of such institution and that such refusal was of a
 25 serious nature and contributed to the disruption of the

1 *administration of such institution, then the institution shall*
 2 *deny any further payment to, or for the benefit of, such*
 3 *individual.*

4 RENEgotIATIOn BOARd

5 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

6 For necessary expenses of the Renegotiation Board, in-
 7 cluding hire of passenger motor vehicles and services as
 8 authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, ~~(16)\$3,000,000~~ \$3,080,000.

9 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

10 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

11 For necessary expenses, including uniforms or allow-
 12 ances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902),
 13 and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, ~~(17)\$17,730,-~~
 14 ~~000~~ \$17,830,000.

15 SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

16 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

17 For expenses necessary for the operation and mainte-
 18 nance of the Selective Service System, as authorized by title
 19 I of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 (62 Stat.
 20 604), as amended, including services as authorized by 5
 21 U.S.C. 3109; expenses of attendance at meetings and of
 22 training for uniformed personnel assigned to the Selective
 23 Service System, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2301-
 24 2318) for civilian employees; hire of motor vehicles; pur-
 25 chase of thirteen passenger motor vehicles for replacement

1 only; not to exceed \$71,000 for the National Selective Serv-
2 ice Appeal Board; and \$60,000 for the National Advisory
3 Committee on the Selection of Physicians, Dentists, and
4 Allied Specialists; \$63,568,000: *Provided*, That during the
5 current fiscal year, the President may exempt this appro-
6 priation from the provisions of subsection (c) of section
7 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, whenever he
8 deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national
9 defense.

10 VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

11 COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

12 For the payment of compensation, pensions, gratuities,
13 and allowances, including burial awards, burial flags, sub-
14 sistence allowances for vocational rehabilitation, emergency
15 and other officers' retirement pay, adjusted-service credits
16 and certificates, as authorized by law; and for payment of
17 amounts of compromises or settlements under 28 U.S.C.
18 2677 of tort claims potentially subject to the offset provisions
19 of 38 U.S.C. 351, \$4,654,336,000, to remain available until
20 expended.

21 READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

22 For the payment of readjustment and rehabilitation
23 benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by law (38
24 U.S.C. chapters 21, 31 (except section 1504), and 33-39).
25 \$612,000,000, to remain available until expended.

VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

For military and naval insurance, national service life insurance, servicemen's indemnities, and service-disabled veterans insurance, to remain available until expended, \$11,850,000, of which \$2,500,000 shall be derived from the Veterans Special Term Insurance Fund.

MEDICAL CARE

For expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of hospitals, nursing homes, and domiciliary facilities; for furnishing, as authorized by law, inpatient and outpatient care and treatment to beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration including care and treatment in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration. and furnishing recreational facilities, supplies and equipment; maintenance and operation of farms and burial grounds; repairing, altering, improving or providing facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration, not otherwise provided for, either by contract or by the hire of temporary employees and purchase of materials; uniforms or allowance therefor as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902) ; and aid to State homes as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 641) ; \$1,420,264,000, plus reimbursements: *Provided*, That allotments and transfers may be made from this appropriation to the Public

1 Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and
2 Welfare, and the Army, Navy, and Air Force of the De-
3 partment of Defense, for disbursements by them under the
4 various headings of their applicable appropriations, of such
5 amounts as are necessary for the care and treatment of bene-
6 ficiaries of the Veterans Administration.

7 **MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH**

8 For expenses necessary for carrying out programs of
9 medical and prosthetic research and development, as author-
10 ized by law, to remain available until expended, ~~(18)\$45,-~~
11 ~~\$50,000~~ \$46,850,000.

12 **MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS**

13 **OPERATING EXPENSES**

14 For expenses necessary for administration of the medical,
15 hospital, domiciliary, construction and supply, research,
16 employee education and training activities, as authorized by
17 law, and for carrying out the provisions of section 5055, title
18 38, United States Code, relating to pilot programs and grants
19 for exchange of medical information, \$14,200,000.

20 **GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES**

21 For necessary operating expenses of the Veterans Ad-
22 ministration, not otherwise provided for, including uniforms
23 or allowances therefor, as authorized by law; not to exceed
24 \$1,000 for official reception and representation expenses;
25 purchase of one passenger motor vehicle (medium sedan

1 for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles;
2 and reimbursement of the General Services Administration
3 for security guard services; ~~(19)\$195,000,000~~ \$197,000,-
4 000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be
5 used to pay in excess of twenty-two persons engaged in
6 public relations work.

7 CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY
8 FACILITIES

9 For hospital and domiciliary facilities, for planning and
10 for major alterations, improvements, and repairs and extend-
11 ing any of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the Veterans
12 Administration or for any of the purposes set forth in sections
13 5001, 5002, and 5004, title 38, United States Code, includ-
14 ing necessary expenses of administration, \$7,926,000, to
15 remain available until expended.

16 GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF STATE NURSING HOMES

17 For grants to assist the several States to construct State
18 home facilities for furnishing nursing home care to veterans,
19 as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 5031-5037), \$4,000,000.
20 to remain available until June 30, 1971.

21 GRANTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

22 For payment to the Republic of the Philippines of
23 grants, as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 631-634),
24 \$1,776,000.

1 LOAN GUARANTY REVOLVING FUND

2 During the current fiscal year, the Loan guaranty revolv-
3 ing fund shall be available for expenses, but not to exceed
4 \$450,000,000, for property acquisitions and other loan guar-
5 anty and insurance operations under Chapter 37, title 38.
6 United States Code, except administrative expenses, as au-
7 thorized by section 1824 of such title: *Provided*, That the
8 unobligated balances including retained earnings of the Direct
9 loan revolving fund shall be available, during the current
10 fiscal year, for transfer to the Loan guaranty revolving fund
11 in such amounts as may be necessary to provide for the
12 timely payment of obligations of such fund and the Admin-
13 istrator of Veterans Affairs shall not be required to pay inter-
14 est on amounts so transferred after the time of such transfer.

15 PAYMENT OF PARTICIPATION SALES INSUFFICIENCIES

16 For the payment of such insufficiencies as may be re-
17 quired by the Federal National Mortgage Association, as
18 trustee, on account of outstanding beneficial interests or par-
19 ticipations in Direct Loan Revolving Fund assets or Loan
20 Guaranty Revolving Fund assets authorized by law to be
21 issued pursuant to section 302 (c) of the Federal National
22 Mortgage Association Charter Act, as amended, \$9,505,000.

23 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

24 Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation for the
25 current fiscal year for "Compensation and pensions", "Re-

1 adjustment benefits", and "Veterans insurance and indemni-
2 ties" may be transferred to any other of the mentioned ap-
3 propriations, but not to exceed 10 per centum of the appro-
4 priations so augmented.

5 Appropriations available to the Veterans Administra-
6 tion for the current fiscal year for salaries and expenses
7 shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C.
8 3109.

9 The appropriation available to the Veterans Administra-
10 tion for the current fiscal year for "Medical care" shall be
11 available for funeral, burial, and other expenses incidental
12 thereto (except burial awards authorized by 38 U.S.C. 902),
13 for beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration receiving
14 care under such appropriations.

15 No part of the appropriations in this Act for the Veter-
16 ans Administration (except the appropriation for "Construc-
17 tion of hospital and domiciliary facilities") shall be available
18 for the purchase of any site for or toward the construction
19 of any new hospital or home.

20 No part of the foregoing appropriations shall be avail-
21 able for hospitalization or examination of any persons except
22 beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such benefits
23 to veterans, unless reimbursement of cost is made to the ap-
24 propriation at such rates as may be fixed by the Administra-
25 tor of Veterans Affairs.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

CIVIL DEFENSE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for carrying out civil defense activities, including the hire of motor vehicles; and financial contributions to the States for civil defense purposes, authorized by law, ~~(20)\$48,040,000~~ \$48,640,000, and in addition, \$50,000 which shall be derived by transfer from Civil Defense Procurement Fund established by the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (50 U.S.C. App. 2264) : *Provided*, That not to exceed ~~(21)\$18,500,000~~ \$19,100,000 shall be available for allocation under section 205 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended.

RESEARCH, SHELTER SURVEY AND MARKING

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for studies and research to develop measures and plans for civil defense; and continuing shelter surveys, marking, stocking, and equipping surveyed spaces; ~~(22)\$10,000,000~~ \$15,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Appropriations contained in this Act for carrying out civil defense activities shall not be available in excess of the limitations on appropriations contained in section 408 of the Federal Civil Defense Act, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2260).

No part of any appropriation in this Act shall be

1 available for the construction of warehouses or for the lease
2 of warehouse space in any building which is to be constructed
3 specifically for civil defense activities.

4 **(23)TITLE II**

5 **DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN**

6 **DEVELOPMENT**

7 **RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE**

8 **HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY OR HANDICAPPED FUND**

9 For the revolving fund established pursuant to section
10 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended (12 U.S.C.
11 1701q et seq.), \$25,000,000, to remain available until
12 expended.

13 **ALASKA HOUSING**

14 For assistance in the provision of housing and related
15 facilities for Alaska natives and other Alaska residents, as
16 authorized by section 1004 of the Demonstration Cities and
17 Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (80 Stat. 1284-
18 1285), \$1,000,000.

19 **GRANTS FOR NEIGHBORHOOD FACILITIES**

20 For grants authorized by section 703 of the Housing
21 and Urban Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3103),
22 \$35,000,000, to remain available until expended.

23 **LOW RENT PUBLIC HOUSING ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS**

24 For the payment of annual contributions to public hous-
25 ing agencies in accordance with section 10 of the United

1 States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1410),
 2 \$350,000,000.

3 **(24) URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAMS**

4 *For grants for urban renewal, fiscal year 1970, as an*
 5 *additional amount for urban renewal programs, as author-*
 6 *ized by title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended*
 7 *(42 U.S.C. 1450 et seq.) and section 314 of the Housing*
 8 *Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1452a), \$1,250,-*
 9 *000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided,*
 10 *That no part of any appropriation in this Act shall be*
 11 *used for administrative expenses in connection with commit-*
 12 *ments for grants aggregating more than the total of amounts*
 13 *available in the current year from the amounts authorized*
 14 *for making such commitments through June 30, 1968, plus*
 15 *the additional amounts appropriated therefor.*

16 **SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

17 *For necessary administrative expenses of programs of*
 18 *renewal and housing assistance, not otherwise provided for,*
 19 *\$34,000,000.*

20 **METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT**

21 **URBAN PLANNING GRANTS**

22 *For an additional amount for "Urban planning grants",*
 23 **(25)** ~~\$38,838,000~~ *\$47,500,000, to remain available until*
 24 *expended.*

OPEN SPACE LAND PROGRAMS

For grants as authorized by title VII of the Housing Act of 1961, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1500-1500e), and the provision of technical assistance to State and local public bodies (including the undertaking of studies and publication of information), \$75,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation in this Act shall be used for administrative expenses in connection with commitments entered into during the current fiscal year for grants aggregating more than the total amounts available in the current year from amounts heretofore appropriated for making such commitments through June 30, 1967, plus the additional amount appropriated herein: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation may be used for financing a grant in excess of 50 per centum of the cost of any activity or project.

GRANTS FOR BASIC WATER AND SEWER FACILITIES

For grants authorized by section 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3102), ~~(26)\$150,000,000~~ \$165,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary administrative expenses of programs of metropolitan development, not otherwise provided for, \$7,000,000.

1 DEMONSTRATIONS AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

2 MODEL CITIES PROGRAMS

3 For financial assistance and administrative expenses in
 4 connection with planning and carrying out comprehensive
 5 city demonstration programs, as authorized by title I of the
 6 Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act
 7 of 1966 (80 Stat. 1255-1261), including ~~(27)\$100,000,-~~
 8 ~~000 \$500,000,000~~ for grants for urban renewal projects
 9 within approved city demonstration programs, to be trans-
 10 ferred to and merged with the appropriation "Urban renewal
 11 programs" for the fiscal year 1969 in accordance with and
 12 subject to the provisions of section 113 of said Act, ~~(28)~~
 13 ~~\$500,000,000 \$1,000,000,000~~: *Provided*, That the amount
 14 appropriated herein for other than urban renewal programs
 15 shall remain available until June 30, 1970.

16 ~~(29)~~ URBAN INFORMATION AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

17 *For grants authorized by title IX of the Demonstration*
 18 *Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (80 Stat.*
 19 *1282-1284), \$2,500,000.*

20 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT TRAINING PROGRAMS

21 For matching grants to States for training and related
 22 activities, and for expenses of providing technical assistance
 23 to State and local governmental or public bodies (including
 24 studies and publication of information), as authorized by

1 title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964 (20 U.S.C. 801–
2 805), \$3,000,000.

3 FELLOWSHIPS FOR CITY PLANNING AND URBAN STUDIES

4 For fellowships for city planning and urban studies as
5 authorized by section 810 of the Housing Act of 1964 (20
6 U.S.C. 811), \$500,000.

7 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

8 For necessary administrative expenses of programs of
9 demonstrations and intergovernmental relations, not other-
10 wise provided for, ~~(30)\$1,860,000~~ \$1,400,000, together
11 with not to exceed \$6,000,000 to be derived from the appro-
12 priation for “Model cities programs”: *Provided*, That no
13 part of this or any other appropriation in this Act may be
14 used to provide metropolitan expeditors~~(31)~~, or for the ad-
15 ministrative or implementation of section 204 of the Demon-
16 stration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966
17 (Public Law 89-754).

18 URBAN RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

19 For necessary expenses of programs of research and
20 studies relating to housing and urban problems, not other-
21 wise provided for, as authorized by law (12 U.S.C. 1701d–
22 3; 1701e; 1701f; 79 Stat. 668; 80 Stat. 1286–1287),
23 ~~(32)\$10,000,000~~ \$15,000,000~~(33)~~: *Provided*, That not to

1 exceed \$500,000 of the foregoing amount shall be available
2 for administrative expenses.

3 LOW INCOME HOUSING DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS

4 For low income housing demonstration programs pur-
5 suant to section 207 of the Housing Act of 1961, as
6 amended (42 U.S.C. 1436), \$2,000,000: *Provided*, That
7 no part of any appropriation in this Act shall be available
8 for administrative expenses in connection with contracts to
9 make grants in excess of the amount herein appropriated.

10 MORTGAGE CREDIT

11 RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM

12 For rent supplement payments authorized by section
13 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965,
14 \$12,000,000: *Provided*, That the limitation otherwise ap-
15 plicable to the maximum payments that may be required
16 in any fiscal year by all contracts entered into under such
17 section is increased by (34) ~~\$25,000,000~~ \$65,000,000: *Pro-*
18 *vided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation or
19 contract authority shall be used for incurring any obligation in
20 connection with any dwelling unit or project which is not
21 either part of a workable program for community improve-
22 ment meeting the requirements of section 101 (c) of the
23 Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1451 (c)), or
24 which is without local official approval for participation in
25 this program.

1 For necessary administrative expenses of the Federal
2 Housing Administration in carrying out functions under sec-
3 tion 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of
4 1965, delegated by the Secretary, \$1,350,000.

5 DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

6 GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

7 For necessary administrative expenses of the Secretary,
8 not otherwise provided for, in overall program planning
9 and direction in the Department, including not to exceed
10 \$2,500 for official reception and representation expenses,
11 \$6,000,000.

12 REGIONAL MANAGEMENT AND SERVICES

13 For necessary administrative expenses, not otherwise
14 provided for, of management and program coordination in
15 the regional offices of the Department, \$6,500,000.

16 (35) FAIR HOUSING PROGRAM

17 *For expenses necessary to carry out the functions of the*
18 *Secretary of Housing and Urban Development under the*
19 *provisions of title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968*
20 *(82 Stat. 81), \$9,000,000.*

21 PAYMENT OF PARTICIPATION SALES INSUFFICIENCIES

22 For the payment of such insufficiencies as may be re-
23 quired by the Federal National Mortgage Association, as
24 trustee, on account of outstanding beneficial interests or par-
25 ticipations in assets of the Department of Housing and Urban

1 Development (including the Federal National Mortgage
2 Association) authorized by law to be issued pursuant to sec-
3 tion 302 (c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association
4 Charter Act, as amended, \$47,638,000.

5 GENERAL PROVISIONS

6 SEC. 102. Where appropriations in this title are expend-
7 able for travel expenses of employees and no specific limita-
8 tion has been placed thereon, the expenditures for such travel
9 expenses may not exceed the amounts set forth therefor in
10 the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations: *Pro-*
11 *vided*, That this section shall not apply to travel performed
12 by uncompensated officials of local boards and appeal boards
13 of the Selective Service System; to travel performed in con-
14 nection with the investigation of aircraft accidents by the
15 Civil Aeronautics Board; to travel performed directly in con-
16 nection with care and treatment of medical beneficiaries of
17 the Veterans Administration; or to payments to interagency
18 motor pool where separately set forth in the budget schedules.

19 SEC. 103. No part of any appropriation contained in this
20 title shall be available to pay the salary of any person filling
21 a position, other than a temporary position, formerly held by
22 an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces of the
23 United States and has satisfactorily completed his period of
24 active military or naval service and has within ninety days

1 after his release from such service or from hospitalization con-
2 tinuing after discharge for a period of not more than one year
3 made application for restoration to his former position and
4 has been certified by the Civil Service Commission as still
5 qualified to perform the duties of his former position and has
6 not been restored thereto.

7 SEC. 104. No part of any appropriation made available
8 by the provisions of this title shall be used for the purchase
9 or sale of real estate or for the purpose of establishing new
10 offices outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That this
11 limitation shall not apply to programs which have been
12 approved by the Congress and appropriations made therefor.

13 TITLE (36)H III—CORPORATIONS

14 The following corporations and agencies, respectively,
15 are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within
16 the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each
17 such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to
18 make such contracts and commitments without regard to
19 fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the
20 Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may
21 be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the
22 Budget for the current fiscal year for each such corporation
23 or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

1 FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

2 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRA-
3 TIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK
4 BOARD

5 Not to exceed a total of \$5,000,000 shall be available
6 for administrative expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank
7 Board, which may procure services as authorized by 5 U.S.C.
8 3109, and contracts for such services with one organization
9 may be renewed annually, and uniforms or allowances there-
10 for in accordance with law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902), and said
11 amount shall be derived from funds available to the Federal
12 Home Loan Bank Board, including those in the Federal
13 Home Loan Bank Board revolving fund and receipts of the
14 Board for the current fiscal year and prior fiscal years, and
15 the Board may utilize and may make payment for services
16 and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal
17 Reserve banks, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance
18 Corporation, and other agencies of the Government (includ-
19 ing payment for office space) : *Provided*, That all necessary
20 expenses in connection with the conservatorship of institu-
21 tions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance
22 Corporation or activities relating to section 6 (i) of the Fed-
23 eral Home Loan Bank Act, section 5 (d) of the Home Own-
24 ers' Loan Act of 1933, or section 407 or 408 of the National
25 Housing Act and all necessary expenses (including services

1 performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other
2 personal services) in connection with the handling, including
3 the purchase, sale, and exchange, of securities on behalf of
4 Federal home-loan banks, and the sale, issuance, and retire-
5 ment of, or payment of interest on, debentures or bonds, under
6 the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, shall be con-
7 sidered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof:
8 *Provided further*, That members and alternates of the Federal
9 Savings and Loan Advisory Council shall be entitled to reim-
10 bursement from the Board as approved by the Board for
11 transportation expenses incurred in attendance at meetings of
12 or concerned with the work of such Council and may be paid
13 not to exceed \$25 per diem in lieu of subsistence: *Provided*
14 *further*, That expenses of any functions of supervision (ex-
15 cept of Federal home-loan banks) vested in or exercisable
16 by the Board shall be considered as nonadministrative ex-
17 penses: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$1,000 shall be
18 available for official reception and representation expenses:
19 *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provisions
20 of this Act, except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore
21 specified, the administrative expenses and other obligations
22 of the Board shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accord-
23 ance with the provisions of the Federal Home Loan Bank
24 Act of July 22, 1932, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1421-1449) :
25 *Provided further*, That the nonadministrative expenses (ex-

cept those included in the first proviso hereof) for the supervision and examination of Federal and State chartered institutions (other than special examinations determined by the Board to be necessary) shall not exceed \$14,396,000.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

Not to exceed \$340,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis and shall be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation, properly capitalized expenditures, expenses in connection with liquidation of insured institutions or activities relating to section 407 or 408 of the National Housing Act, liquidation or handling of assets of or derived from insured institutions, payment of insurance, and action for or toward the avoidance, termination, or minimizing of losses in the case of insured institutions, legal fees and expenses, and payments for expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board determined by said Board to be properly allocable to said Corporation, and said Corporation may utilize and may make payments for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and other agencies of the Government: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the

1 administrative expenses and other obligations of said Cor-
2 poration shall be incurred, allowed and paid in accordance
3 with title IV of the Act of June 27, 1934, as amended (12
4 U.S.C. 1724-1730b).

5 DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN

6 DEVELOPMENT

7 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, HOUSING

8 FOR THE ELDERLY OR HANDICAPPED

9 Not to exceed \$1,272,000 of funds in the revolving fund
10 established pursuant to section 202 of the Housing Act of
11 1959, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701q et seq.), shall be
12 available for administrative expenses.

13 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, COLLEGE

14 HOUSING LOANS

15 Not to exceed \$2,275,000 shall be available for all ad-
16 ministrative expenses of carrying out the program of housing
17 loans to educational institutions (12 U.S.C. 1749-1749d).

18 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, PUBLIC

19 FACILITY LOANS

20 Not to exceed \$1,227,000 of funds in the revolving fund
21 established pursuant to title II of the Housing Amendments
22 of 1955, as amended, shall be available for administrative
23 expenses.

1 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, REVOLVING
2 FUND (LIQUIDATING PROGRAMS)

3 During the current fiscal year not to exceed \$100,000
4 shall be available for administrative expenses, but this amount
5 shall be exclusive of expenses necessary in the case of de-
6 faulted obligations to protect the interests of the Government.

7 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRA-
8 TIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

9 For administrative expenses in carrying out duties im-
10 posed by or pursuant to law, not to exceed ~~(37)\$11,500,000~~
11 ~~\$11,675,000~~ of the various funds of the Federal Housing
12 Administration shall be available, in accordance with the
13 National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701) :
14 *Provided*, That funds shall be available for contract actuarial
15 services (not to exceed \$1,500) : *Provided, further*, That
16 nonadministrative expenses classified by section 2 of Public
17 Law 387, approved October 25, 1949, shall not exceed
18 ~~(38)\$92,000,000~~ \$94,000,000.

19 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL
20 NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

21 Not to exceed \$10,000,000 shall be available for admin-
22 istrative expenses, which shall be on accrual basis, and shall
23 be exclusive of interest paid, expenses (including expenses
24 for fiscal agency services performed on a contract or fee
25 basis) in connection with the issuance and servicing of se-

1 curities, depreciation, properly capitalized expenditures, fees
2 for servicing mortgages, expenses (including services per-
3 formed on a force account, contract or fee basis, but not in-
4 cluding other personal services) in connection with the ac-
5 quisition, protection, operation, maintenance, improvement,
6 or disposition of real or personal property belonging to said
7 Association or in which it has an interest, cost of salaries,
8 wages, travel, and other expenses of persons employed out-
9 side of the continental United States, and all administrative
10 expenses reimbursable from other Government agencies:

11 *Provided*, That the distribution of administrative expenses
12 to the accounts of the Association shall be made in accordance
13 with generally recognized accounting principles and practices.

14 ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, LOW RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

15 Administrative expenses of carrying out the provisions
16 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42
17 U.S.C. 1401-1433) shall be provided for from amounts
18 appropriated therefor in this Act, except that necessary
19 expenses of providing representatives at the sites of non-
20 Federal projects in connection with the construction of such
21 projects by public housing agencies with aid under the
22 United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, shall be
23 compensated by such agencies by the payment of fixed fees
24 which in the aggregate will cover the costs of rendering such
25 services, and expenditures for such purpose shall be con-

1 sidered nonadministrative expenses, and funds received from
2 such payments may be used only for the payment of neces-
3 sary expenses of providing such representatives.

4 TITLE (39) ~~III~~ IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

5 SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this
6 Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any cor-
7 poration or agency included in this Act, shall be used for
8 publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or de-
9 feat legislation pending before the Congress.

10 SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in
11 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any
12 corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used to
13 pay the compensation of any employee engaged in person-
14 nel work in excess of the number that would be provided
15 by a ratio of one such employee to one hundred and thirty-
16 five, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent
17 employees of the corporation or agency concerned: *Pro-*
18 *vided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be
19 considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half-
20 time or more in personnel administration consisting of direc-
21 tion and administration of the personnel program; employ-
22 ment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classifi-
23 cation; employee relations and services; wage administra-
24 tion; and processing, recording, and reporting.

1 SEC. 303. Appropriations and funds available for the
2 administrative expenses of the Department of Housing and
3 Urban Development shall be available in the current fiscal
4 year for purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as au-
5 thorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902) ; hire of passenger
6 motor vehicles; and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

7 SEC. 304. Funds made available for the Department of
8 Housing and Urban Development under title ~~(40)~~ *III* of
9 this Act shall be available, without regard to the limitations on
10 administrative expenses, for legal services on a contract or
11 fee basis, and for utilizing and making payment for services
12 and facilities of Federal National Mortgage Association, Fed-
13 eral Reserve banks or any member thereof, Federal home-
14 loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the
15 Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended
16 (12 U.S.C. 1811-1831).

17 SEC. 305. None of the funds provided herein shall be
18 used to pay any recipient of a grant for the conduct of a re-
19 search project an amount equal to as much as the entire cost
20 of such project.

21 SEC. 306. No part of any appropriation contained in this
22 Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the cur-
23 rent fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

1 SEC. 307. None of the funds in this Act shall be available
 2 to finance interdepartmental boards, commissions, councils,
 3 committees, or similar groups under sec. 214 of the Inde-
 4 pendent Offices Appropriation Act, 1936 (31 U.S.C. 691)
 5 which do not have prior and specific Congressional approval
 6 of such method of financial support(41), *except that during*
 7 *the fiscal year 1969, appropriations of interested departments*
 8 *and agencies shall be available, in aggregate amounts not to*
 9 *exceed those listed herein, for contributions toward expenses of*
 10 *the following committees: President's Council on Youth Op-*
 11 *portunity, \$357,000; Interagency Committee on Mexican-*
 12 *American Affairs, \$575,000; U.S.-Mexico Commission on*
 13 *Border Development and Friendship, \$455,000; National*
 14 *Council on Indian Opportunity, \$375,000.*

15 SEC. 308. No part of the funds appropriated by this
 16 Act shall be used to pay the salary of any Federal employee
 17 who is (42)*finally* convicted in any Federal, State, or local
 18 court of competent jurisdiction, of inciting, promoting, or
 19 carrying on a riot(43), ~~or any group activity~~ resulting in
 20 material damage to property or injury to persons, found to be
 21 in violation of Federal, State, or local laws designed to pro-
 22 tect persons or property in the community concerned.

AN ACT

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 18, 1968

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the
Senate numbered

the Judiciary Committees of both Houses, and by having his appearances before the Courts subject to approval by the Judiciary Committee of either House, the dangers of his becoming a law unto himself are quite limited.

Would the Counsel of Congress become only another cog in the legislative machine or another bureau to house lawyers? The need for such a Counsel to perform oversight functions alone would make his creation worthwhile. There would be a continuity of operation in this regard that cannot be found by the hiring of special counsel for special cases.

Would the Counsel of Congress simply become an extra man in the Court? It has been suggested that the appearance of two attorneys representing the United States would be a travesty. Yet this has occurred without travesty before with a counsel representing Congress on several occasions. Counsel for Congress would not appear as a representative of the "United States" any more than the Court itself represents the "United States" in a trial.

Would the Counsel for Congress provoke direct conflict between the Courts and the Congress? On the contrary, the review functions of the Counsel would keep Congress aware of what the Courts were doing, and the *amicus* function would prevent the Courts from straying far from the intent of Congress. Indeed the Congressional Counsel might relieve some of the Congressional frustration of being unable to do anything about the Courts except complain after decisions are made.

In summary, the proposal to create a Congressional Counsel General is perhaps a novel one, but one which is necessitated by the growth of administrative bureaucracy. It is a means to assist Congress internally by assisting it in performing its oversight function, by review of executive and judicial acts as well as by assisting in improving its legislation. It is also a means to assist Congress externally by keeping the Administrative departments and agencies responsive to Congress from which their authority is derived. In both his internal and external functions the Congressional Counsel General will assist in making Congress a more effective branch of our government and thus strengthen the principle of separation of powers.

APPENDIX

[90th Cong., 1st sess.]

In the Senate of the United States, March 23, 1967; Mr. HARTKE introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. 1384

A bill to establish the Office of Congressional Counsel General

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is hereby established in the legislative branch of the Government the Office of Congressional Counsel General, which shall be under the direction and control of the Congressional Counsel General. The Congressional Counsel General shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate, with the approval of the House of Representatives and the Senate, without reference to political affiliations and solely on the basis of his fitness to perform the duties of his office, and shall be subject to removal by those officers for inefficiency, misconduct, or physical or mental incapacity. The Congressional Counsel General shall be appointed for a term which shall expire at the end of the Congress during which he is appointed. The Congressional Counsel General shall receive the same salary as Members of Congress.

(b) Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Congressional Counsel Gen-

eral may appoint and fix the compensation of such Assistant Counsels General, clerks, and other personnel as may be necessary to carry on the work of his office. Assistants shall be appointed without reference to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of their offices.

(c) The Congressional Counsel General shall promulgate for his office such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the duties imposed upon him by this Act. He may delegate authority for the performance of any such duty to any officer or employee of the Office of the Congressional Counsel General. No persons serving as an officer or employee of such office may engage in any other business, vocation, or employment while so serving.

(d) The Congressional Counsel General shall cause a seal of office to be made for his office, of such design as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the Congressional Counsel General, under such rules as the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and the House of Representatives may prescribe jointly from time to time, to—

(1) render to committees, Members, and disbursing officers of the Congress, and to the Comptroller General, legal opinions upon questions arising under the Constitution and laws of the United States;

(2) render to committees and Members of the Congress advice with respect to the purpose and effect of provisions contained in Acts of the Congress, or to be inserted in proposed legislative measures;

(3) perform such duties with respect to legislative review of executive actions as shall be prescribed by such rules;

(4) appear as *amicus curiae*, upon the request, or with the approval, of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate or House of Representatives, in any action pending in any court of the United States in which there is placed in issue the constitutional validity or interpretation of any Act of the Congress, or the validity of any official proceeding of or action taken by either House of Congress or by any committee, Member, officer, office, or agency of the Congress; and

(5) represent, upon the request, or with the approval of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate or House of Representatives, either House of Congress or any committee, Member, officer, office, or agency of the Congress in any legal action pending in any court of the United States to which such House committee, Member, officer, office, or agency is a party and in which there is placed in issue the validity of any official proceeding of or action taken by such House, committee, Member, officer, office, or agency.

(b) Upon receipt of written notice from the Congressional Counsel General to the effect that he has undertaken pursuant to subsection (a) (5) of this section to perform any such specified representational service with respect to any designated action or proceeding pending or to be instituted in a court of the United States, the Attorney General shall be relieved of responsibility and shall have no authority to perform such service in such action or proceeding except at the request or with the approval of the Congressional Counsel General.

SEC. 3. (a) Subject to applicable rules of practice and procedure, the Congressional Counsel General shall be entitled as of right to appear as *amicus curiae* in any action described in subsection (a) (4) of section 2.

(b) For the purposes of all proceedings incident to the trial and review of any action described by subsection (a) (5) of section 2 with respect to which the Congressional Counsel General has undertaken to provide representational service, and has so notified the Attorney General, the Congressional

Counsel General shall have all powers conferred by law upon the Attorney General, and subordinate of the Attorney General, or any United States attorney.

(c) The Congressional Counsel General, or any attorney of his office designated by him for that purpose, shall be entitled for the purpose of performing duties imposed upon him pursuant to this Act to enter an appearance in any such proceeding before any court of the United States without compliance with any requirement for admission to practice before such court, except that the authorization conferred by this subsection shall not apply with respect to the admission of any person to practice before the United States Supreme Court.

SEC. 4. The Office of the Congressional Counsel General shall have the same privilege of free transmission of official mail matter as other officers of the Congress.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Office of the Congressional Counsel General such sums as may be required for the performance of the duties of the Congressional Counsel General under this Act. Amounts so appropriated shall be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers approved by the Congressional Counsel General.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1969

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 17023) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on a nongermane matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE SUPREME COURT NOMINATIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I spoke yesterday on one phase of the constitutional issue involved in the controversy over the nomination of Justice Fortas to be Chief Justice of the United States and Judge Thornberry to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court.

In the speech yesterday, I discussed the views of 480 deans and professors of 68 of the finest law schools in the Nation, law teachers representing every section of the country, who pointed out that in their opinion the constitutional issue is very clear; that not only is there not the slightest basis for denying this authority to the President of the United States but also that it is his clear duty to make nominations when vacancies occur.

They also pointed out that it is the constitutional duty of the Senate either to confirm or not to give its consent for confirmation, but not to engage in tactics that would prevent the Senate from carrying out its duties under the Constitution.

It appeared from the hearing on the Fortas nomination that a new "constitutional" issue has been dragged into the Fortas nomination. At first I thought it was a spoof. Then I realized that it was just plain ignorance.

I have taught the Constitution. I have lived with the law all my life. But when I saw accounts this week of the Constitution being masked and the history of our Nation from its earliest beginning being ignored, I could not contain myself.

So now I rise to set the record straight—as I see the record—because I want the American people to have the facts which I believe are being denied them.

The claim that the separation of powers is "breached" or "called into question" each time a President seeks the advice of a Supreme Court Justice on matters totally unrelated to the court, flies in the face of almost two centuries of practice and precedent.

In the statement which I read previously, I did not see that George Washington was accused of breaching the Constitution. The author of that statement apparently did not know that Chief Justice John Jay not only gave plenty of advice to George Washington, but—while Chief Justice—also served as our Minister to England.

I did not see John Adams criticized or Chief Justice Ellsworth maligned when history reveals that Ellsworth became Minister to France while he was still Chief Justice.

I did not hear a single word chastizing our great Chief Justice, John Marshall, who served as John Adams' chief foreign policy adviser while still on the court.

I did not hear President Monroe called to task for asking Supreme Court Justice William Johnson for advice on Federal-State matters.

In that glib "off the bench" constitutional opinion rendered day before yesterday, I did not hear Chief Justice Roger Taney censured for advising President Andrew Jackson—both orally and in writing—about a wide variety of matters.

I heard not a single word of criticism leveled against Justice Catron when President Buchanan asked him to draft sections of his inaugural address.

Nor, might I add, was President Abraham Lincoln called a flouter of the Constitution when he asked Justice David Davis who, by the way, was Lincoln's former campaign manager, for opinions on dealing with unrest in the nation and on the legality of imposing martial law by Presidential action.

Not a word in judgment was leveled against Chief Justice Fuller, who gave political advice and counsel to President Grover Cleveland, or against Justice Chase, who was a frequent adviser to Andrew Johnson.

There was no comment on the fact that President Theodore Roosevelt asked for counsel from Justice Moody.

Nor did I hear Justice Brandeis maligned for giving constant advice to President Woodrow Wilson all through World War I. In fact, history shows that one December evening in 1917, President Wilson went to Brandeis' apartment to request advice on certain railroad problems.

I see that no fault was found that Harlan Fiske Stone advised Herbert Hoover and actually commented on drafts of speeches and Executive messages—or the "assistant president" role that Chief Justice Taft—the father of Senator Robert Taft and the grandfather of Congressman ROBERT TAFT, JR.—played in giving close advice to Presidents Hoover, Harding, and Coolidge.

Nor was Justice Frankfurter maligned for the volumes of open records to show his close ties with President Franklin Roosevelt.

No word was raised in anger against President Harry Truman for sending Chief Justice Vinson on a vital diplomatic mission to the Soviet Union during the height of the cold war.

This is only a partial catalog. History is replete with other examples. The record speaks clearly and proudly of almost 200 years of our history. It speaks of Presidents, Republicans and Democrats alike, who have sought and received advice and counsel from members of the Supreme Court in whom they trusted and confided.

But the basic question does not end here. It does not end with the Supreme Court. Is there a single Member of this body—of the separate legislative branch—who would refuse to give advice and counsel to the President? Is there a single Member of this body who has not been in the White House to consult on some matter? Senator Griffin can counsel the President and recommend actions to him on a riot situation in Detroit, but a Supreme Court Justice is not even permitted to read a President's statement about the riots, according to this unfortunate rationale.

What is this nonsense which says that the separation of powers or the Consti-

tution prevents honorable men from consulting with one another on grave issues of the day?

Let us call it what it is—politically motivated and reckless poppycock.

That is the way I see it. That is the way the American people, I believe, are going to see it. And that is the way Presidents, Chief Justices, and Members of Congress have seen it for the past 200 years. Apparently, some of my colleagues are either too young to know or too old to remember the facts of history.

And I cannot leave this matter without an additional observation.

As an American, I am ashamed; as a Senator, I am offended; as a lawyer, I am deeply disturbed by the spectacle—the unprecedented spectacle—of subjecting a Chief Justice nominee to cross-examination on his judicial opinions and his judicial views.

If anything flouts the separation of power, it is this.

Never before in the history of this country has a sitting Justice, nominated for Chief Justice, previously confirmed by the Senate, been questioned on his judicial views by a Senate Committee.

This is the harassing work, in my judgment, of biased men who lack a sense of history, and I am sorry that it is taking place. I hope we will be through with it and get on with the job of carrying out our duty either to confirm or refuse to confirm, under the advise and consent clause of the Constitution.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1969

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17023) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the pending business, the independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriation bill, was laid before the Senate last night. At that time I made a brief general statement on the overall amounts in the bill.

I wish to repeat that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and I are very proud of the committee record—and, if one wants to call it, an economy record—in handling this very important, complex, and large bill. I will point out again today, as I did last night, that over the years—at least, the 14 years that I have handled the bill in the subcommittee and the 10 years that Senator ALLOTT has been involved in the handling of the bill—we have been under the budget estimates a total of \$7,708,657,715, almost \$8 billion.

When someone suggests that the Appropriations Committee and its subcommittees do not go through these items, I should like the RECORD to show that a great deal of work is involved. We consider the items, and we are selective in the matters we approve, or disapprove, and the cuts we make.

Inasmuch as the Senator from Delaware last night was going to voice an objection to a motion to consider the committee amendments en bloc; that the bill, as so amended, be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment; and that no points of order will be waived, I will again, this year, have to take up item by item in the bill and affirmatively move its adoption.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], chairman of the Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Subcommittee, called up the appropriations bill for fiscal year 1969. He noted that this is the 14th year he has been chairman of the subcommittee and that it is my 10th year as ranking minority member of the subcommittee. Chairman MAGNUSON also noted that this bill is \$2,807,165,300 under the budget estimates for fiscal year 1969. While this is accurate, it should be noted that \$2,085,000 of this reduction is in authorizations for participation certificate sales, which the House and the Senate committees have denied and for which the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Housing and Urban Development did not ask restoration. This reduction does not represent a decrease in either new obligational authority or expenditure; therefore, the actual appropriations reduction under the budget estimate in this bill totals \$722,165,300. I do not imply that the chairman and the rest of the committee have not worked to effect some reductions in this bill. Chairman MAGNUSON said yesterday:

Over the years we have been hoping that somebody would pay some attention to the fact that we scrutinize these requests very carefully.

He noted that during his chairmanship budget requests have been cut a total of \$7,708,657,715. I, for one, am well aware of the tremendously difficult and time-consuming work that the chairman has put in on this bill over the years. And I am sure that Senators on the committee and other Senators are aware of this. I want to say again this year that it is a pleasure for me to serve with the chairman in consideration of this appropriations bill.

As all Senators know, the recent Revenue and Expenditure Control Act passed by the Congress effects not only a reduction in new obligational authority and expenditures for fiscal year 1969, but also a cut in personnel to be accomplished by attrition. I feel, and I hope other Senators share this view, that the Congress should take responsibility for carrying out the purposes of this act and not leave the total responsibility to the President.

In fiscal year 1968, 6,000 additional civilian employees were added over fiscal year 1967 in the independent offices appropriation bill, and the budget request for fiscal year 1969 would add another 4,539 employees. This figure, of course, would be somewhat reduced by the Senate committee action and more so by the House action on this bill. It is certainly not rational to be headed in one direc-

tion, which seems to be ever upward in the hiring of civilian personnel, when the Congress has passed an act calling for reduction in personnel. Certainly, there is a growth in the population of this country and there is a need for additional U.S. Government services.

The Federal Government takes most of the tax dollars from our citizens, and so we are called upon here to support to a large extent the various programs that citizens need and demand. But, I see it as our job on the Appropriations Committee and in the Senate to always consider appropriations within the total context of the U.S. budget picture, and to recognize that the budget represents not only expenditures and obligations of the Government, but income to the Government. And, when we are facing tremendous deficits in our Government budget, then we must look at every program and every project proposed by the executive branch to be sure that the dollars we appropriate are necessary for the proper functioning of the Government and are necessary now.

When we mark up this bill, I find myself in agreement with the chairman in most instances as to what should be recommended to the full committee and to the Senate. Particularly this year, I have agreed with Senator MAGNUSON and other members of the committee in making cuts in certain Government agencies. I have also suggested some increases, and one notable one is an increase over the budget estimate of \$15 million for grants for basic water and sewer facilities. I know of no program more worthwhile and more needed than this, particularly for the smaller and middle-sized communities.

On the other side of the coin, I believe that we are overspending and, more importantly, overcommitting the U.S. Government for years to come in certain programs within the Department of Housing and Urban Development. I understand, as do other Senators, about the nature of the needs of the big cities, of the existence of ghettos, of starvation, of poor people in this country, and I share with them the desire to remedy this. But, I am not confident that every program and project pushed forward by HUD is designed to best meet these needs.

As an example, some supporters of the rent supplement program cite rent supplements as one of the exact and perfect answers to the needs of the poor for better housing in our great cities.

I will not argue that in some few instances this may be true, but I will state now, as I have stated for the record before, that this program by its very nature is not designed to alleviate the ghetto conditions in our big cities. There may be other reasons for supporting the rent supplement program, but just let me quote from the record on this point. From the hearings, part II, page 134, Mr. Brownstein, Chairman of the FHA, states in connection with rent supplement projects where land costs are high in central cities:

It would be virtually impossible within the rent limits that we had imposed to construct rent supplement projects, because the kind of construction that would be necessary

there would be high rise construction which, of course, is more costly than low rise. . . . Where you do have the high land cost that requires you to build new construction high rise, it is virtually impossible to do it under the rent supplement program in the absence of land write-down, tax abatement, or a combination of the two.

Concerning the obligation of the Government for many years to programs which will be undertaken under the rent supplement program, I may say more later, but let me just say now in connection with the \$65,000,000 in contract authorization recommended by the committee, but not supported by me, this figure will represent an obligation of the U.S. Government of approximately \$2 billion, because the contracts, once authorized, can run up to 40 years, and my figure is based on an average 35-year contract with only an 85-percent expenditure of the moneys authorized.

Mr. President, I do not want to take more time of the Senate now, but I may comment as different amendments are presented on this bill. Again let me state my admiration for the work that the chairman has done on this bill; I do not want the differences we may have on a few items in this bill to overshadow the fact that the chairman has been most cooperative with me, as he is with all members of the committee, and that generally I am in agreement with him on the recommendations made in the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Colorado for his generous remarks. No one has done more work on this complex and very large bill than the Senator from Colorado. I have often said of him, to other people, in relation to the work on the Appropriations Committee, that he does his homework very well, and as a result we think we do a very fine job together, using a fine-tooth comb, on all the various items in the bill.

It is a difficult bill, too, because we are not dealing with one broad subject. We are dealing with approximately 26 agencies and a department all engaged in different activities. I suppose the best description would be that we have to shift mental gears every time we consider a new agency. That makes it difficult, unless we do our homework and attack the problems in the way the Senator from Colorado always does.

Mr. ALLOTT. As I understand the situation with respect to this matter, the Senator from Delaware has no objection to the adoption of the committee amendments en bloc, with the exception of a few which I understand he is prepared to state. So that we may facilitate this matter to a considerable degree in that way.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The common practice to facilitate the matter has always been to adopt the committee amendments en bloc, without prejudice to any other amendment.

Mr. President, I do think we should have an explanation for the Record, and I shall not take very long on some of these individual items.

The first item is one in which the committee concurred in the action of the House to provide \$25 million in appropriations, instead of participation sales cer-

tificates, for the housing for the elderly and handicapped fund where it is needed for 1969 programs.

The committee further concurred in the House action to deny additional authorization for 1969 or other programs that do not require the funding which effects a net reduction in new budget—obligational—authority of \$2,085 million. This includes \$515 million for the Veterans' Administration, and \$1,570 million for the Department of Housing and Urban Development. That, of course, is the item of participation certificate sales.

I will move the adoption of the committee recommendation on that item.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, before proceeding will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As the Senator from Colorado pointed out, I have no objection to the usual procedure of adopting en bloc most of the amendments in the bill. I am not trying to proceed in a dilatory manner.

However, there are a few items on which I would like to have an explanation with respect to the reason they were increased so substantially over the House figure. It is in connection with those items that I would like to have an explanation. We could proceed routinely until we come to those items.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Delaware has just about forced us to proceed item by item, and it will not take long. We will not have rollcalls on all of them. Whenever we come to an item which the Senator would like a further explanation he can so indicate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, that procedure will be satisfactory. Before we begin I would like to ask the Senator one question. I notice that the report shows we are under last year's appropriation by \$2.5 billion. Can the Senator give us a brief summary as to what programs have been cut to effect the savings of \$2.5 billion? I am sure it is in the bill, but I could not find it. I wonder if the Senator would give us a breakdown.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Part of the cut involved is the elimination of participation sales certificates. Only the \$25 million was restored as an appropriation, the amount I just mentioned. That is the item for housing for the elderly and handicapped fund and we agreed to the House figure.

Many other items were cut below the budget estimates, and I shall explain them as I come to them.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate approve the committee's action on participation certificate sales.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would advise the Senator from Washington that there is an order to call up first the first committee amendment, unless by unanimous consent that is changed.

The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 16, after "5 U.S.C. 3109", strike out "\$1,750,000" and insert "\$1,850,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

The first committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 23, after the word "vehicles", strike out "\$168,600,000" and insert "\$178,600,000".

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, could we have an explanation as to why the Senate thought it was necessary to increase this amount by \$10 million over the House figure?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The committee added the \$10 million to the Appalachian regional development program on the basis of some very impressive testimony that this addition would be used for what seems to be some very promising health programs in the Appalachian area. Those health programs are in the nature of clinics in the field of preventive medicine, working with counties in West Virginia and other areas. Working with the county health people in a number of States, to see what we can do about the health of many of these people so that they can have the benefit of as good medical service as they should have, mainly in the preventive field.

It is understood that this additional amount would be used for principally that purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I noticed that the House had already increased last year's appropriation by \$42 million. I was wondering what took place between the time of the House action and the Senate committee action which would justify the additional \$10 million.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I explained to the Senator from Delaware what took place, as far as I am concerned. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and I have been concerned that so much of this money for Appalachia has been going for building of roads—a great portion of it—but pilot operations are going on that not only look promising but seem to be necessary.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Am I to understand that none of the \$178.6 million would go for roads?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Much of that is for roads. I have the amounts. I can read them to the Senator.

For the Appalachian development highway system, \$168 million. Demonstration health projects—this is one of the items I was talking about—\$24 million. Land stabilization conservation, \$3 million. Mine area restoration, \$4 million. A housing fund of \$1 million. Vocational education facilities, \$14 million. Supplements to Federal grant-in-aid programs, \$34 million. Research and local development district programs, \$3.2 million.

All of these are grant programs, but there are matching funds involved which the States and local communities would contribute to according to their ability. That is the way it breaks down.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The reason I asked the question is that if there is too much being allocated for roads I wonder if we are correcting that situa-

tion when we raise the amount by \$52 million over last year's amount. Could we not merely provide that there should be a greater percent devoted to those projects which the Senator from Washington enumerated, and with which I am in agreement?

Mr. MAGNUSON. We could, but we feel this is a program which should be enlarged. That was the purpose of the original act. We started with small sums. Now there are plans made and they are showing results. The justification for the road program was that the only way the people of the region could be helped economically was by providing means by which the people could get to jobs in the area. Second, we encouraged small industries by providing ingress and egress to and from those areas. The roads were to have first priority. All the money for the roads is matched. The total program has not been completed it is in the early development stages and making progress.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall not make a major point of this particular amendment, but at a time when we are confronted with the necessity of reducing expenditures I do question the wisdom of increasing the amount from \$126 million to \$168 million, representing a \$42 million increase by the House over last year's figures, and then having the Senate committee further increase it by \$10 million to \$178 million. I just wondered if that was necessary. I think we would be making a mistake to so increase it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Part of the reason why we added the \$10 million for the health program and for other purposes was that fiscal 1969 will be the fourth full fiscal year of the Appalachian regional development program. It is the first full year for which this committee has had the opportunity to review the program in its entirety. Fiscal year 1968 appropriations were included in the supplemental appropriation bill enacted shortly before the end of the first session of this Congress. Funds for the highway program were not included, having been previously appropriated in the State-Justice-Commerce appropriation bill.

That is why this amount has increased. In other words, the entire program is now under the full authority of the Commission, and all funds are requested in this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read the next amendment, as follows:

On page 4, line 6, after the word "disasters", strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$15,000,000".

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this amendment relates to the disaster relief fund. It is a revolving fund, which is continuously in operation, because we do not know whether any natural disaster will occur in any given area. Representatives of the Office for Emergency Planning

testified that they cannot accurately estimate what they will need for certain disaster areas.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. The Senator from Colorado has the figures before him.

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes. When the Office of Emergency Planning request first came up, my recollection is they asked for only \$5 million. That was in the first stage. Then after they came back to us, in our final hearing, they asked for this total amount. Of the \$15 million which has been placed in the amendment, \$7.5 million is committed to past disasters which come under the purview of this fund. So actually it leaves only \$7.5 million in the fund until such time as Congress would meet again.

We have traditionally financed these funds at somewhere between \$15 and \$20 million a year. Of the \$15 million that the Senate committee has placed in that fund now, \$7.5 million is already committed for past disasters; \$7.5 million will remain available for disasters which may occur during the rest of the year.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As I understand, sometime between the time the Director asked for \$5 million in funds and the time the Senate committee acted something caused him to change his request?

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes. There were subsequent bills for reimbursement for past disasters.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, ordinarily this is a \$15 million to \$20 million fund to provide to various disasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read the next amendment, as follows:

On page 5, line 21, after the word "expenses", strike out "\$37,000,000" and insert "\$37,564,000".

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the committee added \$564,000 based on the testimony of the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. Macy, for the following reasons:

Assistance to veterans.....	\$364,000
Employment for disadvantaged....	110,000
Printing of test materials.....	90,000
Total.....	\$564,000

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The next committee amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, beginning on line 8, insert the following:

COMMISSION ON EXECUTIVE, LEGISLATIVE, AND JUDICIAL SALARIES
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries, authorized by section 225 of the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967 (81 Stat. 642-645), \$100,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the

Senator from Washington, I am going to ask that this amendment go over temporarily, because the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who is now presiding, also is interested in this amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this amendment go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 9, line 3, after the word "only", strike out "\$19,750,000" and insert "\$20,000,000".

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the committee added \$200,000 to the House figure for the Federal Power Commission, and the total amount is \$1,271,000 below the budget estimate.

Actually, the best way to describe it is to say that they just have more work in that agency. Part of it was to meet unavoidable expenses for emergency communication functions, previously funded by other agencies. Over \$100,000 was for the relocation of the Commission in a new building. The Commission now has to have additional guard service, telephone service, janitor service, and other services which were provided for previously in another appropriation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The assistant legislative clerk read the next amendment, as follows:

On page 9, line 11, after the word "expenses", strike out "\$15,000,000" and insert "\$15,200,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The assistant legislative clerk read the next amendment, as follows:

On page 10, line 11, after the word "moving", strike out "\$271,881,000" and insert "\$276,763,000".

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I would like an explanation of this amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the total amount included in this bill for the General Services Administration is \$499,695,000, an amount which is \$66,886,900 less than the new obligational authority enacted for fiscal year 1968. The bill does not include any new money for new construction starts in fiscal year 1969.

The committee is recommending an increase over the House allowance for only one item in the bill, "Operating Expenses, Public Buildings Service," in the amount of an additional \$4,882,000. The committee's recommendation for this item is \$2 million below the President's budget request.

It is just a question of how much we want to spend on their upkeep, cleaning the buildings, janitor service—all of the things that go with taking care of Federal property.

Considering the amount of Federal property involved, the cost of upkeep compares more than favorably with the amount that a private corporation would spend to keep its buildings up.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Do I understand correctly that there is nothing in this section for the construction of new buildings?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. President, at this point I wish to place in the RECORD an explanation of one item in the bill under the heading "General Services Administration," which follows "Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service."

This comprises, I might say to the Senate, the only new item in the bill, which is an appropriation of \$900,000 for Presidential transition expenses.

This item is carried pursuant to the Presidential Transition Act of 1963—Public Law 88-277. This act provides for transitional expenses for a President-elect and a Vice-President-elect from the day following the general election until the date of inauguration and provides similar transitional expenses for a former President and Vice President for a period of 6 months following the inauguration of a new President and Vice President. Since the act provides that the former President and former Vice President will be provided necessary services and facilities of the same general character as authorized by the act to be provided to the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect it is assumed that the funds made available by this appropriation will be utilized on an equal basis by the outgoing and incoming administrations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The assistant legislative clerk read the next amendment, as follows:

On page 19, line 23, after "\$23,846,000", insert a comma and "of which \$150,000 shall be available for valuation of pipelines".

Mr. MAGNUSON. I might suggest to the Senate at this point that the \$150,000 limitation that was added, is for exactly what is provided in the bill—the valuation of pipelines, which are gas pipelines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The assistant legislative clerk read the next amendment, as follows:

On page 20, line 13, after the word "Administration", strike out "\$3,383,250,000" and insert "\$3,370,300,000".

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington will yield, I think we will want a record vote before we get through on this matter, so if it is agreeable to the Senator from Washington I shall ask that this item go over. Then if we want record votes on other amendments, perhaps we can have them all at one time, meanwhile clearing up the rest of the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Very well. I ask unanimous consent that this and the two items under the heading "National Aeronautics and Space Administration" be passed over. They include research and development, which is one general item, and the construction of facilities, a second item, but not including administrative operations, because we took the House figure on that item.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The assistant legislative clerk read the next amendment, as follows:

On page 22, line 4, after "5 U.S.C. 3109", insert "purchase of one aircraft;"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The assistant legislative clerk read the next amendment, as follows:

On page 22, line 5, after the word "of", strike out "three" and insert "four".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The assistant legislative clerk read the next amendment, as follows:

On page 22, line 12, after the word "services", strike out "\$400,000,000" and insert "\$410,000,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The assistant legislative clerk read the next amendment, as follows:

On page 22, line 20, after the word "appropriation", strike out "And provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for or paid out to the benefit of any individual who at any time after the effective date of this Act, willfully refuses to obey a lawful regulation of the university or college which he is attending or at which he is employed." and insert "And provided further, That if an institution of higher education receiving funds hereunder determines after affording notice and opportunity for hearing to an individual attending, or employed by, such institution that such individual has, after the date of enactment of this Act, willfully refused to obey a lawful regulation or order of such institution and that such refusal was of a serious nature and contributed to the disruption of the administration of such institution, then the institution shall deny any further payment to, or for the benefit of, such individual."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I have a question on this item. Does the Senator from Washington feel that the Senate amendment is a little less restrictive in this connection as far as these students are concerned?

Mr. MAGNUSON. We felt our language probably handles the objective of the House amendment in a much better way than the House language. I think the language is just as strong, but it is much more practical in handling the situation.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, this is the so-called—

Mr. MAGNUSON. Wyman amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. This is the redraft of the Wyman amendment. It was discussed at great length with many departments and agencies, and this language was adopted by the committee unanimously.

The Senator from Delaware will notice that on line 10, the word "shall" has been inserted, which, together with the other language, I think, makes it a much more effective amendment than the original Wyman amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The assistant legislative clerk read the next amendment, as follows:

On page 23, line 17, after "5 U.S.C. 3109", strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert "\$3,080,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The assistant legislative clerk read the next amendment, as follows:

On page 23, line 22, after "5 U.S.C. 3109", strike out "\$17,730,000" and insert "\$17,830,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The assistant legislative clerk read the next amendment as follows:

On page 26, line 19, after the word "expended", strike out "\$45,850,000" and insert "\$46,850,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The assistant legislative clerk read the next amendment, as follows:

On page 27, line 12, after the word "services;" strike out "\$195,000,000" and insert "\$197,000,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The assistant legislative clerk read the next amendment, as follows:

On page 30, line 20, after the word "law," strike out "\$48,040,000" and insert "\$48,640,000".

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio desires to offer an amendment to the amendment. In fairness to him, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will go over.

The assistant legislative clerk read the next amendment, as follows:

On page 31, at the beginning of line 3, strike out "\$18,500,000" and insert "\$19,100,000".

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I make the same request on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The assistant legislative clerk read the next amendment, as follows:

On page 31, line 10, after the word "spaces;" strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$15,000,000".

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this amendment, also, should go over, so I make the same request with respect to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will go over.

The assistant legislative clerk read the next amendment, as follows:

At the top of page 32 insert: "TITLE II".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the amendment is agreed to.

The assistant legislative clerk read the next amendment, as follows:

At the top of page 33 insert:

"URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAMS"

"For grants for urban renewal, fiscal year 1970, as an additional amount for urban renewal programs, as authorized by title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1450 et seq.) and section 314 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1452a), \$1,300,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation in this Act shall be used for administrative expenses in connection with commitments for grants aggregating more than the total of amounts available in the current year from the amounts authorized for making such commitments through June 30, 1968, plus the additional amounts appropriated therefor."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this amendment, also, should go over.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This amendment pertains to urban renewal. I think we should begin to discuss some of the amendments.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is agreeable to me.

Mr. MAGNUSON. However, perhaps this amendment also should go over, so I make the same request as I did with respect to the previous amendments and ask that it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the amendment will be passed over.

The assistant legislative clerk read the next amendment, as follows:

On page 34, at the beginning of line 17, strike out "\$150,000,000" and insert "\$165,000,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The assistant legislative clerk read the next amendment, as follows:

On page 35, line 7, after the word "including" strike out "\$100,000,000" and insert "\$500,000,000".

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, we are coming now to amendments on which there may be requests for yeas-and-nays votes since there is a substantial increase in the amounts.

Would the Senator from Washington be willing to pass over the amendments beginning on page 35, line 7, or would he prefer to begin to discuss them.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I might as well ask again to have this amendment go over also.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the amendment will be passed over.

The assistant legislative clerk read the next amendment, as follows:

On page 35, line 12, after the word "Act," strike out "\$500,000,000" and insert "\$1,000,000,000".

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask that the amendment be passed over.

The assistant legislative clerk read the next amendment, as follows:

On page 35, after line 15, insert:

"URBAN INFORMATION AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE"

"For grants authorized by title IX of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (80 Stat. 1282-1284), \$2,500,000."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be passed over.

The assistant legislative clerk read the next amendment, as follows:

On page 36, line 12, after the word "for," strike out "\$1,860,000" and insert "\$1,400,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The assistant legislative clerk read the next amendment, as follows:

On page 36, line 16, after the word "expeditors" strike out the comma and "or for the administrative or implementation of section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-754)".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The assistant legislative clerk read the next amendments, as follows:

On page 36, at the beginning of line 25, strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$15,000,000"; and, in the same line, after the amendment just stated, strike out the colon and "Provided, That not to exceed \$500,000 of the foregoing amount shall be available for administrative expenses."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

The assistant legislative clerk read the next amendment, as follows:

On page 37, line 17, after the word "by" strike out "\$25,000,000" and insert "\$65,000,000".

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this amendment, likewise, should be passed over.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Consistent with the previous requests, I ask that this amendment be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The assistant legislative clerk read the next amendment, as follows:

On page 38, after line 15, insert:

"FAIR HOUSING PROGRAM

"For expenses necessary to carry out the functions of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development under the provisions of Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 81), \$9,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The assistant legislative clerk read the next amendment, as follows:

On page 40, line 12, after the word "TITLE" strike out "II" and insert "III".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The clerk will state the next amendment.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 45, line 10, after the word "exceed" strike out "\$11,500,000" and insert "\$11,675,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 45, line 13, strike out "\$92,000,000" and insert "\$94,000,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 47, line 4, after the word "TITLE" strike out "III" and insert "IV".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 48, line 7, after the word "Title" strike out "II" and insert "III".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 49, line 3, after the word "support" insert "except that during the fiscal year 1969, appropriations of interested departments and agencies shall be available, in aggregate amounts not to exceed those listed herein, for contributions toward expenses of the following committees: President's Council on Youth Opportunity, \$357,000; Interagency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs, \$575,000; U.S.-Mexico Commission on Border Development and Friendship, \$455,000; National Council on Indian Opportunity, \$375,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 49, line 14, after the word "is" insert "finally."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I would like to ask a question about the amendment. I wonder why the word "finally" was necessary.

The section reads:

No part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to pay the salary of any Federal employee who is *finally* convicted in any Federal, State, or local court of competent jurisdiction, of inciting, promoting, or carrying on a riot [, or any group activity] resulting in material damage to property or injury to persons, found to be in violation of Federal, State, or local laws designed to protect persons or property in the community concerned.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the problem in a situation like this is that a man might be convicted in a justice of the peace court and thus be technically convicted. However, he might carry the case to whatever appellate jurisdiction he would have, and the case might be completely reversed. The statute or ordinance might be found unconstitutional, or the case might be reversed on other grounds by the court.

The language of section 308, the four words "or any group activity" was stricken by the committee in order that it would make more sense. I think it does. And I must confess that the word "finally" was suggested by me to make it more workable. Otherwise, I do not think it would be workable.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I know that the objective of the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Washington in this amendment is exactly the same as mine. If after studying it they feel that those words will strengthen the amendment I have no objection.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I feel frankly that it is not essential. I will not put it to the Senator on that basis. However, it is far more workable with the word in than it would be with the word left out.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We could have a case where a group is arrested. Maybe they are charged. Perhaps they are convicted, and the authorities might have the wrong persons. There would be an

appeal. We want to be sure that they have the right person.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 49, line 14.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 49, line 16, after the word "riot" strike out the comma and "or any group activity".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may I have the attention of the manager of the bill? Somehow the language appearing on page 18 of last year's report on the bill was not included in this year's report.

The language reads:

The committee agrees with the House committee that the Congress intended market rate mortgages in the rent supplement program to be financed in the private market in the usual conventional way, and expects the Secretary to be guided accordingly. In those cases where this is not possible, in every rent supplement project the sponsor shall be required to provide at least a 10% equity investment, except for nonprofit organizations' 5% if assistance is sought under the special assistance program of FNMA.

I am sure it was an oversight on the part of the clerk of the committee that this was not included in this year's report. I know that the matter was discussed during the markup of the bill. However, somehow the language that I have just read was not printed in the RECORD.

I would like to ask that this language be included in this year's report and that in conference the House put it in its conference report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, it is a very important matter. It changes the concept of rent supplements to some extent. The chairman, of course, was opposed to the language last year. Finally, after a lot of conferences, the language was agreed to by the majority of the committee. The language was discussed again this year. The House did not have it in its report. No motion was made that we include the language in our report. I was in attendance all of the time.

Mr. ELLENDER. So was I. And I took it for granted that it would be included in this year's report because we discussed it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There had been a great deal of discussion. Several members of the committee opposed the language last year. The conference report from last year, amendment No. 67 deletes the language and inserts language proposed by the Senate and authorizes \$10 million authority for rent supplement payments instead of the amount proposed by the House and \$40 million proposed by the Senate.

This was all that was said about rent supplements in the conference report for 1968.

I have no personal objection to further consideration of this language. I do not know whether I can speak for other members of the committee. The

Senator from New York, the Senator from New Jersey, and other Senators had some feeling about the matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I suggest.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No action was taken by the full committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. The reason for that is that it was overlooked. We did discuss the matter.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We discussed it, but we did not have a vote as to whether we should or should not put it in this year.

Mr. ELLENDER. It was overlooked. The fact that the committee did it last year and that it was discussed caused us to think the language would be included in this year's report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There was a great deal of testimony by the people who have gone into these projects to the effect that this would be a hindrance, and as of now there have been no approved applications by these nonprofit sponsors that would involve the 5 percent. I have no objection to the language being put in the report if this is possible. The House did not mention it in their report this year.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I want the record to be straight. First of all, with respect to the facts that the Senator from Louisiana has stated, I have just examined the record of the hearings, and throughout the hearings he raised the question of the 5 percent, because it is an integral part of the rent supplement program as it was presented to us. As I recall, he raised this question in the closing hours of the reporting of the bill, and no one objected to it. There was not, as I recall, affirmative action, but nobody said, "No, we don't want that in the bill."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If someone had said, "Put it in the report," there would have been some objection. Whether or not it would have prevailed, I do not know.

Mr. ALLOTT. At any rate, this is my personal recollection.

Now that the report has been printed, there is no way of amending the report at this point, is there?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The only thing that could be done would be a request for unanimous consent that a star print of the report be made, including any changes. This would require unanimous consent.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I make that request for unanimous consent. Frankly, I say that I am opposed to this language. We did not have a vote on it in the committee. Last year we spent two afternoons discussing it, and we talked about the language in the House report. Perhaps I am assuming too much, but I believe if we had had a vote in the committee, they would have voted to put it in the report.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what we did last year, and that is why I suggested it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thought some Senators had seen the light—to leave it out.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, may we have a ruling?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I make a unanimous-consent request that a star print of the report be made and that it contain the language that was in the Senate report last year regarding equity investment on rent supplements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I want to suggest that the chairman is opposed to this. I believe it seriously handicaps the rent supplement program. I do not know how seriously, but I believe most of the Members do feel that it should be retained.

We are now on page 8, the item that went over, line 8, the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield. I understand that the Senator from Virginia desires to offer a substitute amendment.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I should like to obtain the floor in my own right and address myself to this amendment, which I oppose.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The legislative procedure is that this amendment is before the Senate, and the Senator from Virginia will submit his amendment as a substitute, and then he will have the floor.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I rise to oppose the amendment.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Does the Senator from Virginia have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a brief quorum call, without my losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 2515) to authorize the establishment of the Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. SAY-

LOR, and Mr. KUPFERMAN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1969

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17023) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Yesterday, the Senator from Virginia submitted an amendment striking lines 8 through 14 on page 8. My inquiry is this: In lieu of calling up that amendment, if the motion is put to reject the committee amendment, does that have the same effect?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the motion were put positively, the rejection would accomplish the same result. That is the way the questions are put.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, another parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. In accordance with the procedure under which we have been operating, the motion has been put to approve the committee amendment, in which case a negative vote, if that vote prevailed, would strike out the following committee amendment on page 8. Is that correct?

COMMISSION ON EXECUTIVE, LEGISLATIVE, AND JUDICIAL SALARIES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries, authorized by section 225 of the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967 (81 Stat. 642-645), \$100,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, this committee amendment would provide \$100,000 for the expenses of the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries, which Commission was authorized by the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967.

It is significant, I think, that when this bill was before the House of Representatives, neither the House committee nor the House of Representatives included this provision. This provision was inserted by the Senate committee.

I shall undertake to indicate why I feel this is a very undesirable proposal and

why I feel that the appropriation should be stricken from the bill.

The Commission would be appointed as follows: Three members would be appointed by the President, two members would be appointed by the President of the Senate, two members would be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and two members would be appointed by the Chief Justice of the United States.

The purpose of the Commission is to study the salaries of the Members of Congress, members of the Cabinet, and members of the judiciary.

Then, the Commission will bring in a report and submit that report to the President. The President may adopt the recommendations of the Commission or he may go beyond the recommendations of the Commission.

The legislation which this \$100,000 would fund, provides that the President shall include in the budget next submitted by him to the Congress his recommendations with respect to the exact rates of pay which he deems advisable for the Members of Congress, the judiciary, and Cabinet officers.

Mr. President, a public hearing has been going on for about two weeks, considering the qualifications of a Presidential appointee to the Supreme Court. Yesterday and the day before Senators raised questions as to the propriety of the President consulting with a member of the Supreme Court.

I happen not to share the view that there is a great impropriety in this matter, provided as the court nominee asserted, no matters pertaining to the court were discussed by the President or by the Justice. But, Mr. President, if there is any impropriety in a President consulting with a member of the Supreme Court, how much more impropriety is there when the President, under the legislation which this proposal would fund, is given the power and the authority, in effect, to set the salaries of the Supreme Court Justices, and set the salaries of Members of Congress.

It is correct that the President's recommendations will not take effect if the Congress specifically overrides him. I will read the exact language at this point.

The President's recommendations in regard to salaries for Supreme Court Justices and in regard to salaries for Senators and Members of the House of Representatives shall become law if:

First, there has not been enacted into law a statute which establishes rates of pay other than those proposed by all or part of such recommendations,

Second, neither House of the Congress has enacted legislation which specifically disapproves all or part of such recommendations, or

Third, both.

Mr. President, to put the matter another way, if the \$100,000 to fund the new Commission is left in the bill the President will submit his recommendations as to what the salaries shall be of Members of the Senate, Members of the House of Representatives, and the Supreme Court Justices. It seems to me that when so many Senators have spoken

out so clearly and loudly on the floor of the Senate that we are giving too much power to the President, this proposal tends to give him more power, as a practical matter.

I think we all agree, as a practical matter, what we are doing is giving the President the right and power to set the salaries of a coordinate branch of Government. It seems to me that is not a desirable thing to do. The President already has too much power; Congress already has given him too much power; he already has taken too much power.

I would hope that this proposal to fund the Commission would be stricken from the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I support the position of the Senator from Virginia, I think the Senator is correct. Congress heretofore has always regulated the salaries of the executive branch, the legislative branch, and the judicial branch. It should be done by the Congress.

As I have said, I believe the Senator from Virginia is correct. We should not delegate this responsibility or power to the President because certainly, to some extent, a man who can regulate salaries of the executive, the legislative, and the judicial branches, has some control.

As I understand the manner in which this provision would work, the President could appoint the Commission, the Commission could make recommendations to the President in a range, but he would make the final recommendation and submit it to Congress. Unless Congress rejects it, it would automatically become law, as the Hoover Commission report did heretofore. Negative action would be required to reject the President's recommendation.

I opposed the proposal at the time it was suggested in the salary increase bill last year. I still feel the same way, and I join the Senator from Virginia in expressing the hope this proposal can be stricken. If we delete the financing for the Commission we would kill the Commission.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I thank the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I would like to provide a little background for the Senator from Virginia on this matter. Like the Senator from Delaware, I opposed this particular measure when it was passed. The subcommittee did not include any money for the financing of this Presidential Commission. When it came before the full committee, the full committee did decide to finance it, by either a voice vote or a show of hands, I am not sure which. However, the full committee did decide to include it.

I do not agree in any degree with the law which the Senator has just read. The Senator has the reference to the law before him.

I believe that if the members of the judiciary and the Members of the House

and Senate need a salary raise—and Heaven knows, there is plenty of indication they do—then I believe it is our responsibility here, and in the other body, to stand up on this floor and either vote for or against that raise.

The worst part of this piece of legislation, which has already become law, is that it is not just for this time but endlessly in the future that the salaries would be adjusted through the backdoor method which the Senator has described. To my mind, that is the bad part of it. However, it is law. Congress made a law of it. For myself, I shall have to vote with the Senator from Virginia on his motion, because I did in committee.

The reason for my saying anything at this time is that the only solution to the problem is a bill to repeal that law; because, otherwise, it will go on endlessly in the future and we will have the salaries of the judiciary and House and Senate, as well as the officers of the Senate, the Secretary, Sergeant at Arms, and so forth, and the House officers, set in this manner.

Personally, I am not in accord with it. When the time comes, we can consider it directly on its face. I should like to vote either for a salary increase or to vote against one, as my conscience will dictate at that time. But I am certainly in accord with him that this is a bad piece of legislation. But it is a piece of legislation hastily considered and passed by Congress, so that I cannot say in any respect that those who in the full committee voted to put in the \$100,000 were doing anything different than Congress has already told them to do. Whether we put in the \$100,000 or not in the bill to finance the Commission, it is my opinion, unless the Senator can correct me from some citation in the bill, that the Commission will be financed and that the report will come up next spring and the President will make his recommendation.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, this financing of the Commission, as I understand it, is the proposal we are considering today, and the method by which it will be financed unless there is some backdoor method to finance it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I did not hear all of the Senator's remarks because I had to leave the Chamber for an important telephone call, but let me say to the Senator that there is no backdoor proposal here. We passed a law.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. What I am getting at is that the—

Mr. MAGNUSON. The backdoor method would be that since we passed a law, if we do not give it any money to function, as a practical matter, we would repeal that law.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I have the floor.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. That is precisely the argument that was made in committee that if we knock out the \$100,000, that would knock out the Commission and that would be the end of it. In other words, the argument is made that we

legislate by strangulation to the law by taking out the \$100,000. Now, let it be clear that this is the law that was passed by Congress, and these individuals have been commissioned to carry out their responsibilities under that law, so whatever the expense is, it should be met. There should be no subterfuge. It should not be done with any contingency fund. Let the Commission function. Then, if we do not like the findings of the report, and one feels that he is not worth the money they may recommend, let him stand up and vote against it. That is the way I feel about it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The backdoor deal is what we are proposing to do by defeating the committee amendment.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, let us get this in perspective for a moment. The Senator from Colorado expressed the view that this was the way the Commission would be funded. I also think that is the way it would be funded. I do not think it would be funded in any other way.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is right.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. So, if we knock out this provision, as the Senator from Rhode Island just stated, that, in effect, would knock out the Commission because it would not have money on which to operate.

Thus, those of us who oppose the bill, as the Senator from Colorado does, and many other Senators do—the way to knock out the Commission is to kill this amendment, which will knock out funding of the Commission.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then why did everyone in the Senate vote for it?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Everyone in the Senate did not vote for it. It passed just the same. I did not vote for it.

Mr. ALLOTT. I think my friend from Rhode Island disagrees with this point of view, and probably some do—

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. I do not disagree with the amendment. I am merely pointing out—

Mr. ALLOTT. Probably some agree with the point of view that if we knock out the \$100,000, then we knock out the law. However, I think that this could be financed from the President's contingency fund, could it not?

Mr. PASTORE. Will someone tell me how? Where is the authority? The President of the United States cannot begin to allocate money not lawfully appropriated by Congress. He has no right to do that.

Mr. ALLOTT. But he has funds to do it with.

Mr. PASTORE. He cannot do that if we now vote to knock it out, because our action would be a mandate to the President not to do it. Anyway, why should he be worried, if we are not? I do not know where the courage of the Senate is, the courage to decide our own value. If anyone feels that he is not worth it, then let him stand up and face it, when the report comes in.

Let me say that many Senators have to depend upon their Senate salary to live. They have to maintain two homes. They cannot practice law, if they are lawyers, because that would subject them to conflict of interest.

We can go around making speeches and lectures. That gives us a little money. Or we can get tied up with a law firm where we would not do any work, but just have our names on the door, and receive some form of compensation. Those who are lawyers but do not choose to do this have a right to stand up and say, "This is what I think we are worth," when that report comes in. If we feel we are not worth it, then we should stand up and say we are not worth it.

But, so far as the Senator from Rhode Island is concerned, he is willing to assume the responsibility at the proper time and say "I am" or "I am not."

The idea seems to be prevalent that we have got to make big money in order to stay in the Senate with all its demands, unless we happen to come in here as wealthy men, unless we happen to have oil wells, or own a television station, or a radio station, or a law practice which is only a facade. If we are going to make this an institution of the rich, then let the rich stand up and say, "I do not want it because I am not worth it." Many Senators do not even need the \$30,000 salary they now get.

There are many Senators here whose Senate salary is their only means of livelihood. The Senator from Rhode Island happens to be one of them, and he is willing to stand up in this Chamber and say so.

I have had to put three children through college at one and the same time. A father has to go out and really try hard to make both ends meet to do that, as well as to maintain a home in Washington and one in Rhode Island. There are some in the Senate who have a voting residence in their home States but do not have a home in that State. In my State of Rhode Island, a Senator is required to have a home in his State.

All I am arguing here is: Let the men on the commission do their job. Let them come back with the report and then if we do not like it, stand up and vote against it. But the back-door method of killing it off, I say, is just trying to catch a headline or trying to play Captain Courageous on a false premise.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I should like to comment on the remarks just made by the Senator from Rhode Island.

I am not in disagreement with him in any respect in regard to salaries for Members of Congress. I think that the American people want their Senators and Representatives, Supreme Court Justices, as well as Cabinet officers, to have adequate salaries. I believe that that is what the American people want. But I think that under our form of government, the way to do it is for the legislative branch to do what the Senator from Rhode Island has said, we should stand up and be counted by recorded vote.

That is our responsibility. What I object to in this proposal is that we are not assuming our responsibility.

We are delegating our responsibility to somebody else.

We are delegating it to a presumably coequal branch of Government.

We are delegating it to a President,

whoever he may be, when the Presidency already has been delegated too much.

So while I am not in disagreement with anything the Senator from Rhode Island has had to say—as a matter of fact, I think he hit the nail on the head when he said he thought we should vote one way or the other on Senators' salaries—the Senator from Washington mentioned how this bill passed the Senate. I am taking this from my memory, and if my memory is inaccurate, I will have the RECORD corrected; but as I recall the day this came about, the legislation was handled by the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

I presented an amendment to knock out the provision we are talking about. My recollection is that it was knocked out by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] and his committee. When the bill passed the Senate, this proposal, as I recall, was not in the bill. The bill went to conference. This item had been in the House proposal. The bill came back from conference with the item in it. The Senate had to vote upon the conference report, and the conference report contained the entire postal program with the increase in postal rates and increase in postal employees pay.

That is the recollection of the Senator from Virginia. If that is inaccurate, as I say, I will correct the record; but it seems to me there is a matter of policy involved here.

It is a matter of great policy when the executive branch can, in effect, determine the salaries of Members of Congress, recommend the salaries which shall go into effect unless affirmative action is otherwise taken by the legislature.

It would apply to the salaries of Members of the National Legislature, but the recommendations would also apply to members of the Supreme Court. The President appoints the Supreme Court Justices, and they are appointed for life.

So it seems to me we wind up with a problem far bigger than just the \$100,000 involved, and far bigger even than the matter of salaries for Members of the House and Senators.

I express the hope that the Senate would give consideration to knocking out this committee amendment, because, by knocking it out, the Senate would be saying that we disapprove of this way of raising salaries of Members of the House, Members of the Senate, and members of the Supreme Court.

I do not pass judgment on whether those salaries should or should not be greater, or what the figures should be.

All I am saying is that it is a legislative function, and not a function that we should turn over to the President of the United States. We have already turned over too much power to him.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I shall support the amendment of the Senator from Virginia. I want to be direct and frank in my view that this method of increasing the wages of Members of the

Senate, the House of Representatives, and the Judiciary is an indirect method, taking the place of the responsibility of the Congress to deal directly with the granting of increased salaries to the categories of officials I have just mentioned.

We are constantly being belabored to increase the salaries of Federal employees. Every 2 years since I have been here we have granted increases. It is proposed that we grant increases to ourselves in the indirect manner provided for in the procedures of the bill. I point out that the bill was passed on December 16, 1967. The postal rate measure was used to include in it the subject of salaries for Members of Congress and members of the judiciary.

I frankly say that today is the first time that I learned of the fact that this bill was passed. I have spoken to my colleague, and he states that this is the first time he has heard of its passage. I suppose there are other Members on the floor who find themselves in a similar position.

Reading the transcript of the testimony on this item, I note that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], in questioning Mr. Macy, asked the question:

Was that created in the last pay bill we passed?

I infer from that that he did not know when we adopted this indirect method of raising our salaries. The reference to that testimony is on page 1344 of the hearings on the bill.

I have sent for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 16. I take the word of the Senator from Virginia that this item came back in a conference report, in which the conferees of the Senate accepted the position taken by the House on that subject.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I want to emphasize that I am taking it from memory. I did not look it up today. I am taking it from memory.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, for the information of the Senate that is correct. This amendment was in the House bill. It was stricken in the Senate Civil Service and Post Office Committee based on the amendment of the Senator from Virginia. It was not offered on the floor of the Senate. It was adopted in agreeing to the conference report, along with salary increases and all the rest.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I thank the Senator for setting the record straight and confirming my memory.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the conference report came back to the Senate on December 16, 1967, toward the end of the session. I do not know what the record will show concerning the number of Senators who were here at that time or whether this item was specifically discussed on the floor of the Senate on the day it was passed; but I appeal to my colleagues that if the argument is sound that we ought to directly approach our responsibility of fixing our salaries, then we ought not to assign that responsibility to a commission, with that Commis-

sion fixing the salaries but giving Congress the right to veto it.

I note from the testimony in the hearings, on page 1344, that a nine-member commission will make the study and the recommendations. Of the nine members of the Commission, three members will be appointed by the President. They are as of now, Mr. Frederick R. Kappel, who has been designated as Chairman and would have been present at the time the testimony was taken if he has been able to; Mr. George Meany; Mr. John J. Corson. The President of the Senate has named two members to the Commission. The Speaker of the House has named two members. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court has named three members.

We, the beneficiaries of the increase, designate the Commission members. They will be our assignees. They will make the recommendation as to what should be done. They make their study and their recommendation as our appointees and our assignees, send it back to us, and say, "Now, approve it or veto it."

Mr. President, that is not a direct approach to our responsibilities. It is an indirect approach. It indicates a fear on our part to face the problem directly.

If we keep increasing our salaries, how can we ever deny the demands of other groups of Federal employees when they ask for increases? I believe, Mr. President, that if we are to obtain the increases which have been suggested, we should do it directly.

I say respectfully that I have no law office. I concur with what the Senator from Rhode Island has said about individuals maintaining law offices with their names on the door as a fiction, doing no work and drawing down salaries.

This is a bad method of providing for ourselves the increases that might be justified, and for that reason, Mr. President, I support the Senator from Virginia in the motion which he has made.

Moreover, when the Senate approached this problem, it knocked out the provision for fixing salaries in this manner. Then in conference, they put it back in, and in the closing days of the session, it was approved, at a time when the probability is that practically no Senators were present in the Chamber, and I venture to say there was not a rollcall vote when the conference report was agreed to. I will check that point for the record later.

I thank the Senator for permitting me to speak on this subject.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I might say in that connection that even if there had been a rollcall vote, it involves a very complicated major piece of legislation; and I do not know whether the Senate would have been justified in knocking down that whole piece of legislation to strike at this one item.

So, as a practical matter, today is the first time the Senate has had an opportunity to pass judgment directly on the wisdom or lack of wisdom of creating such a commission.

I might note also, Mr. President, that last year or the year before, I cannot remember which, the Senate agreed to an amendment to the Reorganization Act—that, too, being presented and handled on the floor by the senior Senator from

Oklahoma—saying exactly what the Senator from Rhode Island mentioned a moment ago, that increases in congressional salaries should be enacted only after a record vote in the Senate or in the House of Representatives. I think what the Senate did applied only to the Senate, with the recommendation that the House of Representatives take the same action.

So this proposal runs directly counter to what the Senate has already voted to do a year and a half or so ago. I repeat, Mr. President, this is the first time that Members of the Senate individually have had the opportunity to go on record as favoring or opposing this roundabout method of bringing about salary increases for positions in the Cabinet, in Congress, and in the judiciary.

I should like to read at this point testimony by Mr. John W. Macy, Jr., from the U.S. Civil Service Commission, when testifying before the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee. He says, speaking of the proposal we are now discussing:

This establishes a study on a statutory basis so that every 4 years this is done in order to make sure that there is a regular review of these salaries.

So, as the Senator from Colorado so ably pointed out a little while ago, if the Senate goes on record today as approving this type of procedure and approving this Commission by funding it, the effect will be that it will become a permanent Commission, and every 4 years the President of the United States will submit what salary he thinks Members of Congress and Supreme Court Justices should receive.

Of course, I emphasize again that Congress, by an affirmative vote, can turn down his recommendations, but Senators will find it is very complicated to do that. I shall read into the RECORD exactly what would have to be done; but before doing that, I wish to return to a point made by the Senator from Ohio.

This Commission would submit its recommendations to the President, but the President could completely disregard them and say, in effect, "Look, you fellows in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, be good to me and I will not follow this Commission report and give you \$40,000. I will give you \$50,000."

I do not suggest that the present President would do any such thing as that; as a matter of fact, I am sure he would not. But we do not know who will be President 5 years from now, 4 years from now, or even next year.

I believe that, as a practical matter, the President would be setting the salaries, because here is what the Senate and the House of Representatives would have to do if they did not wish to follow his recommendations. Public Law 90-206, dated December 16, 1967, provides as follows:

(1) Effective date of Recommendations of the President: (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, all or part (as the case may be) of the recommendations of the President transmitted to the Congress in the budget under subsection (h) of this section shall become effective at the beginning of the first pay period which be-

gins after the thirtieth day following the transmittal of such recommendations to the Budget.

So, in the first place, there would be only 30 days for both Houses of Congress to act, and only to the extent that, between the date of transmittal of such recommendations and the beginning of such first pay period: First, there has not been enacted into law a statute which establishes rates of pay other than those proposed in the recommendation; second, neither House of Congress has enacted legislation which specifically disproves; or third, both.

I wish to say again, Mr. President, that I feel that Members of Congress, members of the courts; and members of the Cabinet should be adequately compensated.

I do not know of any other group of men who work as hard for the salaries they receive as do the men in this Chamber.

I am looking at the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who is the deputy majority leader; I think he has been present on the floor of the Senate every day, and perhaps every hour, that this Congress has been in session.

I believe that Members of Congress deserve adequate and proper compensation. What I object to is establishing a commission to make a recommendation to the President, and the President then, whether he takes the advice of the Commission or goes beyond that advice, putting into effect what really becomes a salary for the members of the legislative and judicial branches of the Government. I cannot help but believe that that is a very unwise procedure to follow over any extended period of time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not think there is any Senator who would find himself in substantial disagreement with the Senator from Virginia.

I opposed this amendment in the committee. The subcommittee opposed it and did not include it in its report. But after we discussed the matter further in full committee, we found that this Commission has been appointed.

A great number of able Americans are on the Commission.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will finish first and then yield.

We are not a legislative committee. We were faced only with one proposition: Shall we provide funds for a lawful Commission to operate, a Commission which has been appointed?

The full committee decided the matter, but not with my vote. All of the statements about who have offices and who do not is beside the point as far as the Appropriations Committee is concerned. This is an active, ongoing, permanent Commission. We were just submitted an item from the budget to finance the Commission, to make the study and the report.

I think what we should do here is to have someone introduce a bill pronto and abolish the Commission.

The law is still on the books, and these people are able to work for nothing. The law would still apply. They do

not have to have this money particularly. If the Senator saw the list of eminent people on the Commission, he would realize they could work for nothing. We do not need to give them any money with which to operate. What we should do is to repeal the law.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. In a moment. We are not a legislative committee. We are an Appropriation Committee. The subcommittee voted to strike this. I voted to strike it. The full committee after some discussion decided that as long as they are there, we should give them a small, modest amount to operate with. They do not need it. They could still function without the funds. I do not know whether they would or not, but they might.

I took a look at the membership list again. I know two or three of them by reputation. I imagine that they could very well work for nothing.

I know that we talk a lot about the fact that Members of Congress could recommend anything. They could recommend an expense account. The Members would not have to touch the salaries. They could recommend all kinds of things. They could even recommend—I do not think it would happen—a decrease. Maybe we are not worth what we get. Then the President would have to act. Congress could not touch it under the law that we passed until the President sends up a recommendation.

We were faced with that issue, and the subcommittee finally decided it would give them a modest amount to operate with as long as the Commission was set up.

I agree with the basic tenets espoused by the Senator from Virginia. However, this is an Appropriation Committee. It is not a legislative committee.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I point out that the House Appropriations Committee did not appropriate a single dollar. The House of Representatives did not appropriate a single dollar.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The matter was never submitted to the House. It was only considered by the Senate.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. The date of enactment was December 16, 1967, 8 months ago.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The appropriation was never considered by the House. It was never submitted by the Bureau of the Budget to the House. It came to us as a Presidential communication after the House had passed this bill. It is in Senate Document 80 for the record. The House never considered this at all.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. That is what I am pointing out.

Mr. MAGNUSON. One of the arguments made by those who wanted the \$100,000 put back in is that as long as the House did not consider it and it was small, we might do this and take it to conference and see what they might want to do with it. However, this Commission could get to work tomorrow if they wanted to, and the law still exists. If we do not do something about their

recommendations and the President sends up something, it would be the law.

I suggest that we introduce a bill to repeal the law.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I think that the outcome of this vote today will determine whether the Members of the Senate are interested in repealing this law. This is a policy vote. This is a matter that goes far beyond the \$100,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand that. What I am trying to talk about is the responsibility of the Appropriations Committee. We are not a legislative committee. I would vote to repeal the law tomorrow.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. This is a good way to get the matter settled.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If we should do this, then we could pass all of the laws we wanted to pass here and just not give them any money but repudiate them after the laws have been passed. We could just refuse to give them the wherewithal with which to operate.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. With relation to some laws, it would be a very good thing, and particularly this one.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then we should abolish some things by giving them no funds. There are a lot of things that we appropriate money for that I voted against in the legislative proposal. However, when the measure becomes law, I have a responsibility to see that it functions.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. It did not come to a vote.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays now.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I think the Record should be clear that the Appropriations Committee is not a legislative committee, and if Congress establishes a Commission, we surely have the responsibility to take a look at it and see how much money we should give them with which to function once they are established.

In this case the subcommittee said, "No. We do not need to do it now." However, they have been appointed. It is not a question of our determining the policy or the wisdom of Congress in passing a law.

The vote of the full committee, for the benefit of the Record, was 14 to 8.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. This will be the first time that the Senate, as a Senate, will have had a chance to vote on the matter.

Mr. MAGNUSON. To make a clear-cut decision on it. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. It will be the first time the Senate has had a direct vote on the issue. When the postal pay bill of 1967 came to the Senate, the Senate committee took out this provision that the House had inserted. So, when it came to the Senate for a vote, it did not contain this provision. It was put in in conference with the House.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will yield in a mo-

ment. That is our legislative process, whether we like it or not.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. The Senator is correct. However, it is also correct that this is the first time we will have had a direct vote on the issue.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I believe that would be true. But it is not on the policy issue. It concerns the money to run a legally authorized Commission.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have found in the RECORD of December 12, 1967, on page S18419, exactly what happened with respect to this item.

Mr. MONRONEY, who was in charge of the postal rate increase bill, stated:

May I say that from the first day until the last day, and almost every hour on the hour, the conferees on the House side tried to keep the junk mail rate at the lower rate. The House provided 3.6 cents. They also insisted on the House passed version of the Presidential Commission. We were just as adamant. In fact, as those matters were taken up and as we saw the quarreling and the snarls, I was reminded of the old law of physics that the Senator and I learned in our universities—that when an irresistible force meets an immovable object, something has to give.

The fact is that it was in conference; the House conferees insisted upon the Presidential Commission. Senator MONRONEY said, "I had to give in."

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. The Senate conferees were unanimous in opposition to it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. They had to give in in order to get any type of bill, and that is why they gave in.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. For the clarification of the Members of the Senate, the motion is being made by the subcommittee chairman according to customary procedure to adopt the committee amendment. Is that it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is actually on the adoption of the committee amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It would be to knock out the \$100,000.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Those who favor knocking out the \$100,000 would vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Byrd amendment is not pending, then?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

Mr. ALLOTT. So if a Senator desired to vote to strike out the \$100,000, he would vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii

[Mr. INOUE] is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 41, as follows:

[No. 217 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Anderson	Hayden	Muskie
Baker	Hollings	Nelson
Brewster	Jackson	Pastore
Brooke	Javits	Pearson
Burdick	Kuchel	Pell
Cannon	Long, La.	Proxmire
Case	McGee	Scott
Church	McGovern	Smathers
Dirksen	McIntyre	Smith
Dodd	Metcalf	Sparkman
Fong	Miller	Tydings
Gore	Monroney	Williams, N.J.
Harris	Montoya	Yarborough
Hart	Morse	Young, N. Dak.
Hartke	Morton	
Hatfield	Moss	

NAYS—41

Aiken	Ervin	Mundt
Allott	Fannin	Murphy
Bennett	Gruening	Randolph
Bible	Hansen	Ribicoff
Boggs	Hickenlooper	Russell
Byrd, Va.	Hill	Spong
Byrd, W. Va.	Holland	Stennis
Carlson	Hruska	Symington
Cooper	Jordan, N.C.	Talmadge
Cotton	Jordan, Idaho	Thurmond
Curtis	Lausche	Tower
Dominick	Magnuson	Williams, Del.
Eastland	Mansfield	Young, Ohio
Ellender	McClellan	

NOT VOTING—12

Bartlett	Griffin	McCarthy
Bayh	Inouye	Mondale
Clark	Kennedy	Percy
Fulbright	Long, Mo.	Prouty

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CHANGE IN CONFEREES

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be excused from serving as a conferee on S. 20, a bill to provide for a comprehensive review of national water resource problems and programs, and for other purposes, which conference meets at 3

p.m. today, and that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] be appointed as a conferee in my place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at this time I would like to ask the distinguished majority leader about the program for the balance of the day and for the balance of the week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by the distinguished minority leader, after consultation with the majority whip, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the secretary of the Democratic conference, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], we have shown the minority leader a list of possibilities, which I will read for the benefit of the Senate.

At the conclusion of the consideration and disposition of the pending business, it is the intention to turn to the farm bill—and, incidentally, the Senate will be in session on Saturday—and following the farm bill we will take up either the appropriation bill for transportation or the appropriation bill for public works.

Following that, it is hoped to take up the bills having to do with long staple cotton, mutual funds, and the flexible interest rate measure.

Following that—and this, of course, goes way into next week—there will be the Labor and HEW appropriations, if reported; State, Justice, and Commerce appropriations, if reported; and the Renegotiation Act extension.

That fits in pretty much with what the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] indicated in his remarks on yesterday.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. May I ask the majority leader, does he anticipate that the farm bill would be under consideration on Saturday if not finished on Friday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Oh, yes; indeed.

Mr. NELSON. Does the Senator have any notion whether it can be finished in the next few days?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have a hope.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I can only say to the distinguished Senator that there are a number of amendments to be offered, including one applying to farm migrant labor. The distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] is not in the Chamber at the moment, but that is a highly controversial amendment, and I am sure it will provoke considerable discussion.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1969

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17023) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban De-

velopment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, line 13, strike out "\$3,383,250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,370,300,000."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move adoption of the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, line 14, strike out "\$3,370,300,000" and insert "\$3,070,300,000".

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Because we are following the usual procedure, I believe that the Senator from Delaware might have made a motion to adopt the committee amendment. I understand that the Senator from Delaware now has an amendment to that amendment to lower the figure.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. So that the Senator's amendment would be pending.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. A vote "aye" on the Senator's amendment would cut the amount for NASA, and a vote of "nay" would, in effect, mean that we would go back and vote on the original committee amendment; is that not correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The Senator states it correctly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall be brief. Several other amendments to increase appropriations will be offered later, many of which will be of interest to various Senators; for example, there is the urban renewal, the supplemental rent controls, and various other items. If we are going to add all of these other measures we have got to reduce at some point. In my opinion one place we can cut back is on the space program.

I believe that the space program is an essential activity of the Government, but I do not think it is so essential that we get to the moon on a certain schedule. I think that this is an area where we can easily cut back at least \$300 million, which is not quite, but approximately a 10-percent reduction.

I certainly hope that the Senate can adopt this amendment.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, if there is no opposition to this amendment we can accept it unanimously right here and now.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the NASA budget is divided into three parts—first, research and development; second, con-

struction of facilities; and third, administrative operation.

I doubt whether anyone in this Chamber is more sympathetic in general with the purposes of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] than I am. However, I must say that I cannot see, in this day and age, simply tearing apart all of the structure of the work we have done in space simply for the purpose of trying to cut some money out of the budget.

If we are going to effect cuts, there will be plenty of opportunity this afternoon for Senators present in this Chamber to effect other cuts.

Mr. President, for the sake of the RECORD, the 1968 appropriation, the year just concluded, in this particular budget, was \$3,925,000,000. The budget estimate for this coming year is \$3,677,000,000. The authorization is \$3,370,000,000. The House allowance—and they are not ordinarily overgenerous in these respects—is \$3,383,250,000.

The truth of the matter is that NASA has already cut its research staff and its research contracts drastically throughout the entire budget. First, the NASA budget has been severely reduced. The President has already taken vigorous action to reduce the NASA budget, taking into account the fiscal situation and other priorities.

Last year, I reluctantly accepted the \$500 million reduction made by the House Appropriations Committee. This year, the budget request was \$700 million below the proposed request for 1968, and \$200 million below the amount appropriated for the fiscal year 1968.

The amount recommended by the committee in the bill, \$3,370,000,000, already represents a substantial cut from the previous year's appropriation of \$3,900,000,000.

Thus, Mr. President, I think it amounts to this: I am perfectly aware of the necessities and the pressures for appropriations. I understand there will be additional requests this afternoon, even above the committee's action, in the field of housing and urban planning. But I do not believe we are being wise with the total use of our resources, or wise with the total input we have already put into NASA in research and development, if we make a further additional cut here. As a matter of fact, it would literally stop all further activities of NASA beyond the present Apollo program.

Mr. President, we do not know exactly what the Russians are doing; but we cannot presume, for one moment, that the shots they are making continuously, and will probably continue to make throughout this year, do not contain additional methods of surveillance and perhaps even antiorbiting laboratories or weapons.

We cannot stand here on the floor of the Senate this afternoon and accept the concept that in the planning of the Russians, they have not planned to put various vehicles into the sky which will have an active and present potentiality of nuclear warfare in any portion of the world against which they would be released. In fact, the total activities that can be imagined are so great as to stagger the imagination.

In my opinion, the cut which we have made this year already in the NASA appropriations, which is a cut from over \$5 billion last year to a total of \$4,008 million this year, is the most drastic cut taken in any element of our appropriation.

I would like to say just one thing about the on-going results of this cut. The outflowing results of the total NASA appropriations in the field of science, technology, and business have already been so great that they have had an active effect upon the total business of the United States. A member of one large corporation said recently that in 10 years, 17 percent of its business would be in the production of facilities which were a scientific fallout of NASA and which do not even exist today.

So, I urge my colleagues, let us not be pennywise and pound foolish. We have, in round figures, \$30 billion invested in the total space program. And in the total area of research and development, we appropriated \$3,926 million in 1964, \$4,363,500,000 in 1965, \$4,531,000,000 in 1966, \$4,245,000,000 in 1967, and, as I have already indicated, \$3,925,000,000 during the fiscal year just closed, 1968.

I sincerely hope that my colleagues will not take this step of being pennywise and pound foolish. All of the really advanced research from which we may expect real scientific progress has already been cut out of the budget by the present reductions. This is a hard budget. It represents the reduction of many thousands of men already dependent upon the space effort under various contracts pertaining to the space program.

I sincerely hope the amendment of the Senator from Delaware will be defeated.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I join in what the distinguished Senator from Colorado has said. This is a most difficult appropriation in these times, but when one weighs all the factors, he finds that the conclusions the Senator from Colorado came to are absolutely correct.

The NASA appropriation this year was cut considerably under the budget figure. As a matter of fact, the Senate committee cut the Research and Development amount under the House figure, because the legislative authorization committee cut it. It adds up to what the committee said in its report:

The committee concurs in the House recommendation that only the most important and the highest priority programs be funded at this time.

We think we have done that. We think we have cut out any program that is not of the highest priority and what we would consider as important and essential.

The committee also says that it is essential to continue the momentum of the Apollo program that has been re-established and reprogramed because of the cut in funds.

I think it would be unwise to make this kind of cut, which in turn would not only slow up the program but disrupt the whole program. We have constantly cut it. The budget cut it. The authorizing committee cut it. It is down to what we

consider, I repeat, as only the essential, important, and highest priority programs.

NASA funds have been reviewed at length and in detail by the House and Senate in the authorizing and appropriating process. All postponable and reducible programs have been cut. NASA originally requested \$4,370,400,000. This committee recommends a figure of \$4,008,223,000, or a cut of \$362.2 million which coincides with the proposed House appropriation. This committee's budgetary recommendation is \$4.8 million under the final House-Senate approved authorization of \$4,013,073,000. The committee's recommended funds will enable NASA to carry out a viable effort of essential programs at an austere level.

The NASA aerospace effort has helped significantly to put this country into the leading role in technology. This lead role has benefited the country across a broad spectrum of the economy. NASA's implementation of the national commitment to land men on the moon is well along a making good headway. We want to maintain that momentum. Earth-oriented space applications programs are providing important advances in international communications and global weather forecasting. Both technologies are of vast importance, not only to this country but to all countries. We can look forward to the promising potential for the benefit of all mankind of earth resource sensing satellites to give us quick global crop predictions, help in the search for new mineral wealth, and give us an improved inventory of surface water resources. We are now entering into a period of really useful payoff from the space investment already made.

This austere funding for NASA recognizes the tight budgetary picture of the economy; at the same time it recognizes that the aerospace program has already made a great contribution to the country, with even greater contributions in prospect. We, therefore, recommend that the program be funded at this minimum level of essential effort.

I think that sums it up as well as I can sum it up, without going too much into detail.

The spin-off has been great. There can be a chain reaction in something like this that is not in direct proportion to the amount of the cut. The result can become 10 times as great. The program involves the jobs of some 450,000 Americans, over 90 percent of them are in private industry, as I remember the figure. They are learning and making America strong scientifically and technically—not necessarily just in space programs, but in many fields.

The committee worked long and hard on this item. It got down to what we thought, in cooperation with the authorization committee, will put us in a position, if we want to continue the program, to take advantage of all the money we have spent previously.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, one of my duties is to serve on the Aeronautical and Space Sciences legislative committee under the able chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the minority leader-

ship of the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. I know how much difficulty we have had this year in trying to provide an authorization bill which would enable the continuance of this program, and we have cut very appreciably and have made cuts in all of the items which were not allowed the highest priority. We did that in the authorization bill.

Another of my duties is to sit in the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which handles the independent offices appropriation bill. We continued the process of cutting, cutting, cutting wherever we could, but trying to put first things first and allowing the continuance of the Apollo program, which is the overall first thing, on a basis where it can be wound up in a creditable way for our own country.

Our own country is on the line in the eyes of the world as a whole in a contest with our greatest rival, the Soviet Union, in the effort to reach the moon. Some of us may not approve of that effort. Some of us may not think it is worthwhile.

Some of us may think there are other features of the program more worthwhile, such as the communications program, in which we have done so much, such as the weather program, where we have accomplished so much, such as the general program for the increase of scientific knowledge, where we have done a monumental job. But I think every American realizes the truth of the fact that the real issue which we have assumed for ourselves for a period of years and which the Soviet Union has accepted for a period of years, and which the world recognizes as an issue between our two great forms of government, is, so far as we are concerned, can we complete in creditable fashion the Apollo program on time, or virtually on time, and, hopefully, can we be first in the completion of that challenging program?

Mr. President, just to give some idea of the actual amount accomplished by way of reduction for this important research and development program: Last year's appropriation was \$3,925 million. Our authorization this year was only \$3,370 million, which, as I read the figures, is a \$555 million reduction below the fiscal 1968 appropriation.

When we got to the question of the appropriation, Mr. President, we had come before us the director of this program, Mr. Webb, and others who were most knowledgeable concerning it, and they told us that this was absolutely all the cut that this particular part of the program could possibly carry and still allow them the chance to go through with their reorganized Apollo program—and they had already reorganized it so as to stretch out certain production schedules in the original plan in order to remain within available funds.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield to my friend from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Is it not a fact that even under this program as we have it here, NASA probably will have to cancel all Saturn 1-B orders, and stop the production of the Saturn 1-B?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct. They may not only cancel in that regard, but they may have to cancel other very important programs.

The Senator from Colorado was correct in his statement that the contractors have had to lay off many thousands of skilled men, and the Senator from Washington, the chairman, was correct in his statement to the same effect.

The question is, Have we meant business in this program that we undertook so many years ago, and do we propose to see it through on this already reduced basis?

Mr. President, insofar as this whole appropriation which the committee recommends for the space program is concerned, it is \$580 million under the appropriation of last year—more than half a billion dollars. Insofar as this particular part of the program, research and development, which is the principal part, is concerned, the cut is \$555 million. Out of that \$580 million total cut, \$555 million is the cut on the research and development program.

Mr. President, I cannot from memory go into every detail, and I would not attempt to do so if I could; but I want the Senate to know, I want the RECORD to show, and I want the country to be informed that both the Space Legislative Committee and the Subcommittee on Appropriations handling this matter, as well as the full Committee on Appropriations, have endeavored to cut this program to the bone and yet to allow the Apollo program to go through to completion.

It has required reorganization of the Apollo program. But it is still on the track, and the administrators tell us they hope and believe they can see it through, if there is no further cut in the NASA research and development program.

Mr. President, I know what the Senate has hoped for in the way of overall cutting of expenditures. The Senator from Delaware, who offers this amendment, is the Senator who offered the expenditure reduction amendment, together with my distinguished colleague from Florida, for the \$6 billion cut. I supported him rather loyally throughout that fight. I am glad we have made that reduction and have instituted that program. But I say to the Senator that in my judgment—and I have been through both phases of this matter—we will simply be turning down the most important part of this program, and making it impossible of fulfillment, if we further cut the research and development appropriation, which we have already cut \$555 million below the appropriation of last year.

Research and development covers, of course, the construction of the lunch vehicles used. It covers an immense part of the entire program. When you add to it certain facilities programs—which are a minor feature, because nearly all of the buildings and the structures have been built—and the personnel or administrative program, you have the whole picture.

Research and development is the principal part of the total program. The necessary effect of this additional reduction of \$300 million now proposed by the

Senator from Delaware—and I am not finding fault with him, except on this one score—will undoubtedly be against the Apollo program. I think this is a program too precious and too complicated for anybody not having careful knowledge of what has been done to suggest and expect to make a cut of this size, in a program of this importance to our Nation.

Mr. President, I back up completely the statements made by my distinguished leading colleagues in this fight, the Senator from Colorado, the ranking minority Member, who has spoken at some length, and the Senator from Washington, our chairman. They are eminently correct. So far as I am concerned, I simply comment that from my dual standpoint of seeing this expense reduction matter grow and come along, both in the legislative committee and in the Appropriations Committee, I think we have done all we can do without gravely hurting the Apollo program; and I hope that we will not even consider striking it such a detrimental blow that it would require complete reprogramming and a long postponement of its completion, a slowing down of the program, the turning off of thousands of people, and, in every way, the revamping of the most important part of the space program. If this enormous cut to an already greatly reduced research and development program should be made by the Senate, this would be the result.

My own feeling is that the \$555 million reduction which we have made here already is a substantial contribution to the \$6 billion cut which the Senator from Delaware has attempted, and in which I have supported his efforts. I hope that the amendment will fail, and that the Apollo program, which means so much to our people and our Nation and to the cause of science in our country and the world—which is, of course, the important thing—will be permitted to go ahead.

Mr. President, one further word and I shall be through. I feel that the people of the Nation are looking to the Apollo program to decide whether we are going to go forward with those stages which follow. If the Apollo program is completed creditably and on time, or substantially so, I think it will be such an enormous accomplishment that we will see a restoration of confidence and a restoration of enthusiastic public support on the part of people who are now doubtful about this whole space effort.

Mr. President, the question now is not whether we should have entered into it. The question is whether we shall complete it; and if the appropriation is further reduced, the completion of this first and most important step, the Apollo program, will simply be set back—and that is nothing to smile about, I say to my distinguished friend from Delaware, because it would be a cruel blow to the ambitions of our country, and in particular to the ambitions of the scientific community of our country, who have worked so many years toward successful completion, which they think will be a challenge to the world as well as a justification of the way a great democratic nation can go after the fulfillment of an objective which it entered into earnestly so many years ago.

Mr. President, I hope that the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall be very brief.

I am not debating the merits of this program. I respect the opinions of my colleagues. I merely point out that if we are to achieve this \$6 billion reduction we must start somewhere.

I point out that this is not the only item in the bill for the space program.

Altogether, there are three items in the bill to provide a total of a little over \$4 billion for the space program. The purpose of the pending amendment is to reduce that amount by \$300 million, or approximately 7 percent. I do not question for a moment that we could take any program mentioned in the pending bill or in any other bill and make a very good argument why, from a meritorious standpoint, that particular program should proceed. However, at some point, somewhere we must cut back on some programs which are popular and which each of us thinks are essential. There are measures contained in the bill, as I mentioned earlier, dealing with the question of whether we should add \$400 million to the demonstration cities program. There is a request for a \$500 million increase in this bill for urban development. There is an extra section here that is not in the House bill to add \$1.3 billion for the urban renewal program.

Each of those matters will be argued by those who are sponsoring them as being meritorious. Perhaps they are. I am not debating that.

The question is how long we can continue to expand each and every one of these programs without cutting back on some other programs. For example, last year under the urban renewal programs we had \$750 million contained in the bill. The bill on which we will vote shortly contains \$1.3 billion, or an increase of \$550 million.

The question is. Are we going to carry all of these programs as we have heretofore and still expand some of the other programs which we think have a higher priority, or are we going to cut back on some of them?

My own personal opinion is that we can absorb this \$300 million cut in the program, and it would still leave this agency approximately \$3.75 billion; and that is not peanuts where I come from.

Mr. President, I am ready to vote.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I would like to comment briefly on that part of the independent offices appropriation bill which relates to providing funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

On June 18, the House reported that it had accepted the Senate's amendments to H.R. 15856, the NASA authorization bill for fiscal year 1969.

As the ranking minority member of the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, I would like to make it abundantly clear that while I was pleased that as a result of this House action the authorization bill fully expressed the will of the Senate, I was not and am not at all pleased with the content of the bill itself.

I will not restate my position on the

space program since I had my full say during the Senate's consideration of the authorization bill, and I have been in politics long enough to fully understand and agree with the need for practicality in such matters.

It just seems to me that the Senate's judgment on many matters—whether it be appropriations or gun control—can be likened to a pendulum: swinging from one extreme to another. I fear that the current position of the pendulum is resulting in decision that are penny wise and pound foolish.

I believe I am as mindful as any of my colleagues that our current budgetary situation makes it necessary to carefully scrutinize each agency's funding request. Nevertheless, in an age when science and technology are so desperately important to keeping a nation strong, both from an economic and defense standpoint, I find it difficult to understand why the majority of the Senate would wish to curtail our space technology programs to the extent it did.

Briefly, what this bill does is reduce to a snail's pace our space applications program which has a capability of providing substantial benefits in such diverse fields as agriculture, geology, oceanography, and shipping; severely curtail our planetary exploration program which potentially could provide us with a deeper understanding of our environment, as well as a general knowledge of our entire universe; and require NASA to sharply reduce its technical manpower, which, in essence, provides the brainpower needed to continue the tremendous successes of the space program to date.

To those of you who are yet to be convinced that the industrial power of a nation, of which science and technology is the backbone, is the controlling factor as to whether a nation lives or dies, prospers or decays—I refer you to the recent history of any number of nations which have taken diverse paths in regard to the development of a solid base in science and technology. I am certain you will find that, with little exception, those nations which have nurtured and encouraged its science and technology are the same nations which have achieved a more prosperous and better life for its citizens.

It is my hope that we will not have to wait too long before the pendulum swings back to a more middle range. And, I hope also, that my colleagues will agree with the necessity of providing funds to NASA, at least in the amount now provided in H.R. 17023.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend all the staff members of both the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee and the Appropriations Committee for their impartial and conscientious assistance during our many hearings and in the reporting of these bills.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, NASA has been cut more than any other agency. Its budget has been cut 20 percent from the budget request of fiscal year 1968. This has forced the agency—NASA—to retrench deeply so that now only the most important programs can be funded with the amount in the bill. Deeper cuts

will mean cutting back severely ongoing programs. This will result in great waste of funds already spent since NASA will be unable to complete, and thereby get the results from, programs on which a great deal of money has been spent already.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the authorizing committee for appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, I urge the support of the Senate for the \$4,008,223,000 recommended for that agency in the independent offices appropriation bill (H.R. 17023) now under discussion. The NASA budget request for fiscal year 1969 was cut \$219,840,000 by the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences and further reduced by \$137,487,000 for a total cut of \$357,327,000 during the authorization process. The Senate Appropriations Committee is now recommending a further reduction of \$4,850,000, leaving an amount which is identical to that appropriated by the House.

I should like to stress that the amount now recommended is \$580 million below that appropriated by the Congress for NASA for fiscal year 1968 and over \$1 billion below that requested by the administration for NASA for fiscal year 1968. This reduction of 20 percent is made at a time when the agency's programs are maturing and therefore reductions seriously impair the agency's ability to continue the programs and achieve the objectives which were originally intended and approved by the Congress. The \$4 billion in H.R. 17023 is basically for the support of ongoing programs at an austere level and will provide only for the most minimum commitments for maintaining the capability to undertake future programs which will equip this Nation with a viable space program in the years ahead. Mr. President, I urge that the Senate support the amount recommended by the Appropriations Committee for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

I would also like to say that we have had remarkably fine work from the committee members.

I appreciate very much what the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] had to say. All through the hearings he was asking questions and trying to find out what would be affected by proposed cuts. I heard the Senator this afternoon. I know he is one who has become convinced that the amounts recommended are necessary and that the programs are essential and proper.

The distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] did a wonderful job as chairman.

The distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] always takes a deeply studied and consequently an extremely strong position on these matters, year in and year out.

Mr. President, I hope the NASA appropriation is not further cut or reduced by the decision of the Senate.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his kind words.

I hesitate to say anything after the very factual and forceful presentation by the distinguished Senator from

Maine. As always, she presents things very clearly.

Professor Bernell once said that wars are conducted not with intelligence, but upon the basis of gusts of emotion. And I am afraid that that is what is being attempted here this afternoon.

Before I close, I would like to say a few words in an effort to try to encourage my colleagues not to march up the long hill for the acquisition of science, knowledge, and capability and then, before reaching the summit, lose our courage and stumble and fall down and have to start back up the hill again.

Many things have been a direct fallout of the space program. I would like to read two or three things that I made some notes on.

One is heat-resisting electronic components designed for rocket systems which lengthen the life of every radio and television set produced in the United States.

A computer technique used to clarify pictures from the moon is enhancing the value of X-ray pictures for medical diagnosis.

Grooving highway pavement, resulting from NASA studies of aircraft skidding on runways, has reduced highway accidents as much as 90 percent in the cases in which it has been employed.

A sight switch, developed to help astronauts cope with instrument panels during blastoff, has been adapted as a control device on motorized wheelchairs for paraplegics. A spray-on electrode developed by NASA flight researchers enables doctors to get better and more accurate cardiographs with less static, and much more accurately records the heart's reaction to exercise. A continual measurement of uniformity of the thickness of steelplate in rolling mills is measured now by means of an infrared sensor originally developed as an arise sensor for the Nimbus satellites.

Another item I should like to point to is this: When NASA launched the Early Bird for Comsat; 3 years ago, for example, it boosted the capacity of the Trans-Atlantic telephone system by 50 percent. Where would we have been today with Telcom if we had not had NASA? It already has been estimated that this whole new industry will be grossing \$200 million by 1975.

Another clear advance: This year a series of 3 satellites scheduled for launch each with a 1,200 circuit capacity and at a cost of some \$9 million, Intelsat III, will take its place in the highly complex network of beneficial communications satellites. By comparison, the 720-circuit underwater system—not 1,200—designed to go into place between Rhode Island and the Iberian Peninsula, will require an estimated \$70 million capital investment, as compared with the \$9 million in Intelsat III, which will give us a 1,200-circuit capacity.

Where would we be without these advances? I could go on and on, but these are just a few of the advances that have come from NASA.

Mr. John Moore, the vice president of North American Rockwell, recently stated that the space program has brought about more than 12,000 new

products and techniques which did not exist a decade ago.

So the real question here today, Mr. President, is this: In the total NASA authorizations this year, we have cut them from over \$5 billion to \$4,008 million, which is not a cut of 10 percent, as the Senator from Delaware set up in his amendment a few weeks ago, but a cut of 20 percent. We are faced this afternoon, it seems to me, with a fundamental question, and it is a serious one. Having marched up this long hill for the conquest of space, for the conquest of scientific knowledge—which no one can deny has just begun to spread its beneficent influence over every phase of our building and construction, our thought, our schools, our universities, and our students—are we going to put in another cut, after the cut the committee has put in, which will almost fully destroy the further down-the-line space capability of NASA? I sincerely hope Senators will not do it. To me, it represents a step backward from reality. It represents a step backward from the vision and the foresight which America should be showing today. It represents a step backward from the actuality and reality of the threats of the Russian system, which we cannot afford to do in this country.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the budget request for space this year was \$4,370,400,000. The bill as reported by the committee was in the amount of \$4,008,223,000, or a reduction of approximately \$362 million. The amendment now pending would reduce the amount further by \$300 million. If both of them are adopted it would mean a \$600 million reduction, or approximately 15 percent. It would still leave in this bill \$3.75 billion. I say this is all that we can afford.

The Senator from Colorado has made an excellent argument as to the advances and the great achievements in the last few years since we started the space program. I am not belittling this program. In fact, I will point out a few other achievements that we have developed since we entered this space age, because I believe in giving the opposition all the benefits of the argument that can be used on their side.

As the Senator from Colorado said, there have been many spectacular achievements, but one he did not mention is that our national debt has increased astronomically. We are almost to the moon with the national debt. On the other hand, our deficit this year will be the largest deficit in the history of our country, around \$25 billion. That is the estimate for the fiscal year 1968. That is an average deficit of \$2 billion a month—another achievement in this space age.

Likewise, inflation is eating up the American dollar for our aged and those on pension—a great achievement in this space age.

And why has this inflation developed? Because the Government has consistently spent more money than it has; and in order to finance the debt we have had to borrow that money in the money markets with the result that interest rates today are likewise at their highest level in 100 years.

I believe all these facts must be considered as we continuously expand these appropriation bills. I am wondering whether it is not time that we come out of space, put our feet firmly on the ground, and start talking about just how much we can afford.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I sincerely and vigorously urge that there be no cut in this particular program.

A year ago, when the National Aeronautics and Space Administration budget was last before Congress, I raised the warning that too much was hanging in the balance of play budget-cutting exercises with the space effort. Congress of course has the responsibility to reduce spending wherever it can at the Federal level. The space program is as open to spending cuts as any other Federal program. But blind, arbitrary slashes can cause mortal wounds.

We avoided the mortal wounds last year. I can only hope we will do so again this year.

As I observed on this floor last month, the House earlier chopped this vital program back from \$60 million to \$11.7 million. In so doing, it failed to leave enough money even to close out the project. The ax fell without reason or direction.

Fortunately, the House subsequently agreed with the Senate authorization for NASA, which contained \$55 million for NERVA. Subsequent to that, the Senate Space Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee approved the same total figure for NASA which was approved by the House.

Mr. President, I commend to the attention of my distinguished colleagues the language contained in the Appropriations Committee report which argues persuasively in favor of realistic funding for the NERVA program:

The committee concurs in the House recommendation that only the most important and highest priority programs be funded at this time. It is essential to continue the momentum of the Apollo program that has been reestablished. Also, the committee is convinced that without the development of a nuclear rocket engine it is not possible to project a viable space program based on advancement in propulsion capability, and deferral of such development will be very costly to the Nation in the long run.

For the NERVA program, being developed jointly by NASA and AEC, the NASA authorization is \$55 million and the AEC authorization is \$69 million. The committee recommends that an adequate funding level be provided to assure that a balanced program is maintained between the two agencies.

We have heard all the arguments in behalf of NERVA many times over. We know that this nuclear rocket engine is the inevitable next step forward, that the program is already eminently successful, that 1 year's delay now will cost us 5 to 6 years later, that leadtime is needed to maintain a continuous advance in technology, and that, if we do not perfect a nuclear rocket engine, the Russians soon will. I will not attempt to retrace all these familiar points. I would rather concentrate on the area that concerns us most this year of financial problems. I will argue on the money points.

Few among us, I think, realize the NERVA program—which will double our

space capability—is costing less than 1½ percent of the overall space budget. The request this year, for example, is 1.3 percent. What is more, it is not expected ever to exceed 3 percent at any time during the flight engine development. So, point 1 is that this program, which will deliver such big results, is costing comparatively little. The experts call this cost effectiveness, I think.

Point 2, as I pointed out earlier, we have already invested well more than \$1 billion in this effort. It becomes nothing short of foolish to abandon it now at this critical juncture merely to shave a few figures off total appropriations.

Point 3, it would actually be more expensive in immediate spending to shut down all this fine work. The actual cost of keeping it running is less than the phase-out expense.

So we must begin to ask: Where is the saving? We are really too far committed—and we should be—to withdraw now. If we examine all the issues with reason and justice, we will see clearly that it is far too costly to defer or delay.

Point 4 is perhaps the most telling argument. That point is the long-range cost of shutting down and reactivating at some future date. The added price of this rather futile gesture toward budget cutting runs to an estimated \$300 million, as I stressed earlier.

This is costly economy, Mr. President. I do not think our Nation can afford it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, may I add just a brief remark on NASA's nuclear rocket program.

Fifty-five million dollars are needed to proceed with the essentials of the NASA phase of the nuclear rocket development program. NASA has requested \$60 million. The Senate authorizing committee, under the very able leadership of Chairman ANDERSON, recommended \$55 million for a minimum useful program, a figure subsequently approved by the House and Senate.

Funding at this reduced level will permit the start of an engine system development leading to a flight engine in the late 1970's. It will allow a parallel and balanced development activity between NASA and the AEC.

This is the only propulsion development program that offers a firm promise of significantly advancing U.S. space propulsion capabilities over the next decade. These capabilities will be applicable to a broad spectrum of potential advanced civil-military missions. The nuclear rocket is not aimed at replacing existing large chemical rockets. Rather, its use would be in combination with an existing chemical rocket and in order to enhance significantly—in some missions double—the latter's capabilities.

We have had a history of lagging behind the Soviet Union in space propulsion capabilities and then in trying to catch up. We do not want to repeat this mistake in 1968, and, therefore, recommend proceeding forward with the nuclear rocket development at the reduced \$55 million level.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. The matter pending is the Williams amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. So a vote for the Williams amendment would be a vote to cut \$300 million additionally out of the research program. A vote against it would be to sustain the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE] is absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 52, as follows:

[No. 218 Leg.]

YEAS—34

Bayh	Gruening	Pell
Boggs	Hansen	Proxmire
Brewster	Hart	Randolph
Burdick	Hatfield	Ribicoff
Byrd, Va.	Hollings	Spong
Byrd, W. Va.	Mansfield	Symington
Church	McGovern	Talmadge
Cooper	McIntyre	Tydings
Cotton	Metcalf	Williams, Del.
Dirksen	Morton	Young, N. Dak.
Ervin	Nelson	
Gore	Pastore	

NAYS—52

Alken	Hartke	Moss
Allott	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Anderson	Hill	Murphy
Baker	Holland	Muskie
Bennett	Hruska	Pearson
Bible	Jackson	Russell
Brooke	Javits	Scott
Cannon	Jordan, N.C.	Smathers
Carlson	Jordan, Idaho	Smith
Case	Kuchel	Sparkman
Curtis	Long, La.	Stennis
Dodd	Magnuson	Thurmond
Dominick	McClellan	Tower
Eastland	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Ellender	Miller	Yarborough
Fannin	Monroney	Young, Ohio
Fong	Montoya	
Griffin	Morse	

NOT VOTING—13

Bartlett	Inouye	Mondale
Clark	Kennedy	Percy
Fulbright	Lausche	Prouty
Harris	Long, Mo.	
Hayden	McCarthy	

So the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. KUCHEL and Mr. HOLLAND moved to lay the motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 20, line 13, to strike out "\$3,383,250,000" and insert "\$3,370,300,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, line 19, after the word "law", strike out "\$21,800,000" and insert "\$34,750,000".

AMENDMENTS NO. 880

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up my Amendments No. 880 and ask that they be stated and considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio to consider his amendments at this time? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will report the amendments, and they will be considered en bloc.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 30, line 21, strike out "\$48,640,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$43,040,000".

On page 31, line 10, strike out "\$15,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$10,000,000".

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, briefly stated, my amendment would cut the civil defense appropriation by \$10,600,000, slightly more than 16 percent of the amount recommended by the Committee on Appropriations. It would reduce the recommended appropriation for operation and maintenance from \$48,640,000 to \$43,040,000, and the recommended appropriation for research, shelter, survey, and marking from \$15 to \$10 million.

Mr. President officials of the Department of Defense requested \$76,800,000 for civil defense purposes for fiscal year 1969. The House of Representatives reduced that figure to \$58,040,000. Then, the Senate Committee on Appropriations added \$5 million for shelters, survey, and marking and an additional \$600 thousand for operation and maintenance, for a total appropriation of \$63,400,000—\$5.6 million more than approved by the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I do not know of a single method whereby we could more clearly manifest our desire to save taxpayers' money than by reducing appropriations for the civil defense boondoggle. Here is an opportunity for Senators to demonstrate that they mean

what they say when they call for economy in government and the elimination of unnecessary spending.

How can the Congress in good conscience cut appropriations for the Headstart program, the Teacher Corps, school lunch programs, and a multitude of other vital welfare programs, and at the same time, continue to spend millions of dollars on the completely useless civil defense program. More than \$1,700,000,000 has gone down the drain to date for this boondoggle and Americans are no more secure than they would have been without that tremendous expenditure.

It appears that all appropriation bills proposed by the Department of Defense seem to be automatically approved. They seem to fall in the same category as the Stars and Stripes, or motherhood. In reality, the civil defense program has nothing whatever to do with the defense of our Nation. It offers nothing whatever toward our national security, nor toward the maintenance of our defense posture. It has been an utter waste of taxpayers' money since its inception.

In my judgment, this entire program should be scrapped. However, being a realist, I have offered a modest amendment, which at least will save \$10,600,000. Surely, \$53 million should suffice for fiscal year 1969. President Johnson has called for the elimination of all non-essential expenditures. If ever there were a program that comes within the category of nonessential expenditures, it is the so-called civil defense program.

First, there was an evacuation plan whereby people would flee from one city to another city. For example, in event of a nuclear attack they were to flee, at the sound of sirens, from Cleveland, Ohio, toward Lorain, Ohio, 25 miles west, on the Lake Road. Then, the Lorain civil defense authorities, under their evacuation plan, would have the people flee east from Lorain toward Cleveland on the same road. Finally, that silly scheme was abandoned. Now they have this inane shelter-marking program. If there were ever a program in the category of non-essential, it is this.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may we have order? I cannot clearly understand the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be order in the Senate.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, today, more than 23 years after the atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima and after the expenditure of almost \$2 billion of taxpayers' money, the United States has no civil defense program worthy of the name. Most of what exists consists of absurd plans on paper; the rest is confusion.

Only recently, millions of propaganda letters and home survey questionnaires relative to proposed home shelters were sent out by the Bureau of the Census, acting as agent for civil defense officials in the Department of Defense, at the astonishing cost of \$8 million. This questionnaire was ridiculous in its concept and outrageous in its execution—the worst recent example of thousands of silly and absurd schemes concocted over the years by civil defense officials for want of something better to do.

The fact is that reliable American ob-

servers in the Soviet Union have reported that they have not noted any civil defense shelter program of any sort of civilian defense program in the Soviet Union, except, perhaps, for some survival training courses and some courses in guerrilla warfare. No provision has been made for fallout shelters in newly built structures within the Soviet Union nor within the huge subway system in Moscow. Evidently, Soviet leaders have had the good sense not to squander their country's resources on futile programs that would add nothing whatever to the defense of their nation.

Mr. President, our only defense is to make it crystal clear to the Soviet leaders that a first strike against us will trigger unbearable retaliation. We now maintain a 3- or 4-to-1 advantage over the Soviet Union in the number of strategic missiles we possess. But even this does not fully measure our real advantage. Above everything else, we maintain 41 Polaris submarines each carrying 16 missiles with nuclear warheads. The most modern of these missiles has a maximum range of approximately 2,875 land miles. No area within the vast land mass of the Soviet Union or Communist China is safe from devastation by missiles fired from these submarines.

Leaders of the Soviet Union and Communist China are well aware of the tremendous offensive power that we possess and of our ability to annihilate an enemy by instant retaliation. Furthermore, the Soviet Union is no longer ruled by a tyrant such as Stalin. It is no longer a "have not" nation, but a "have" nation seeking to raise the standard of living of its people. Present leadership is evincing cooperation toward us instead of threatening annihilation. The Soviet Union is no longer the menace it once was to the peace of the world. It is really unthinkable that there would be any nuclear conflict between us.

There is no other nuclear power in the world that threatens us today. Communist China, which has a crude nuclear capacity, will not have the capacity to make any sort of nuclear attack on us whatever before 1975. Nothing being done today by the civil defense bureaucrats will be of any use whatever 5 years from now. It is a certainty that a reduction of slightly more than \$10 million in the civil defense appropriation this year will in no conceivable way affect our defense posture in 1974 or 1975.

Year after year, we in Congress have continued to appropriate huge sums for civil defense in piecemeal fashion, but not for any serious plan of action. In reality we were grasping at straws, for no one in his heart really believed that the civil defense program would be of any protection in a nuclear holocaust. Senators will again hear the timeworn argument that we should have at least a minimum civil defense program "just in case." Last year, more than \$80 million was spent on civil defense. Does this Nation have any more civil defense in the event of a nuclear attack than we had a year ago? The answer is, of course, an emphatic "No."

Today, more than 160 million shelter spaces have been "located." Over 101,000 of these structures have been marked.

Very few have been stocked with any supplies, but they are marked. We know of some in Ohio. They were stocked. Then it was learned on inspection that medicines like penicillin had spoiled, that the food had rotted, and that the water was undrinkable.

Does anyone really believe that these so-called fallout shelters, which are in reality apartment house corridors, office building basements, parking garages, and the like, are going to be of any real protection? Even if one could possibly accept this premise, how much more of the taxpayers' money must be spent on little black and yellow signs telling citizens where to go to meet their deaths in the horrible event of a nuclear Armageddon?

I am certain, Mr. President, that no man worth his salt with a wife and children elsewhere would desert them in an instant of peril and rush down to some basement space marked off as an ostensible shelter area. I am sure no one would do that.

How much more money are we going to spend? Surely, \$10 million should suffice for this purpose for the coming fiscal year, instead of the \$15 million recommended by the committee.

Public apathy regarding our civil defense program could not be greater. The truth is citizens have completely lost faith in the civil defense boondoggle. Mayors in cities throughout the Nation, including New York City, Los Angeles, Baltimore, and Portland, Oreg., have either completely discarded their local civil defense programs or have ignored them to the point where for all practical purposes they have been eliminated.

Frequently, we Senators receive calls and letters from mayors and other municipal officials requesting assistance in having their applications for public works and other Federal projects expedited. At the same time, the Federal Government is encouraging these officials to spend millions of dollars for civil defense employees and on ridiculous civil defense follies. If we cut off the head of the bureaucratic octopus in Washington, its wasteful satellites in States and cities will soon wither away. The adoption of my amendment—and mine is a very modest amendment—would be a good beginning toward that end.

The committee has recommended more than \$48 million for operation and maintenance of the civil defense organizations. More than 826 employees now work in the civil defense division of the Department of Defense. Of this number, more than half receive from \$13,000 a year up to \$27,000 a year in salaries. I am sure Senators will be surprised to learn that the average annual salary of all civil defense employees from the Director down to the lowliest file clerk, is in excess of \$12,000 a year.

We have a great many overpaid and underworked employees in all the departments; but those in Civil Defense are among the highest paid in the entire Federal bureaucracy.

In contrast, officials and employees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation—which many regard as one of the most important Federal agencies—receive an

average of approximately \$9,000 a year. In the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—an agency with many scientists and highly skilled and educated technical personnel—the average salary for officials and employees is approximately \$11,500 a year. I am a member of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, and know something about that agency. It is astonishing that the average salary of NASA officials and employees is less than the average for those in the Civil Defense division of the Department of Defense. The average salary for officials and employees in the Office of Economic Opportunity is \$9,500 a year; but their responsibility is to the poor and not to perpetuate the ridiculous civil defense boondoggle. The average salary for officials and employees of the Small Business Administration is \$10,700 a year; in the Civil Aeronautics Board, \$11,400. Interestingly enough, the average salary of officials and employees for the Department of the Army is \$7,300 contrasted with the \$12,000 a year average for Civil Defense employees, who are technically part of the Department of the Army.

If my amendment is adopted and \$5,600,000 is cut from the appropriations for operations and maintenance, I am sure that the civil defense agency will be able to struggle along on more than \$43 million for its boondoggle functions in fiscal year 1969. It may even be necessary to transfer some of these high-salaried civil defense bureaucrats to agencies where they can perform a needed public service, if they have the ability to do so—and I have my doubts on that score. I doubt that there is another agency in the Federal Government where so many employees have done so little for so much money. Frankly, this outfit has become the catchall, or cesspool, for Army officers and civilians who spend time concocting propaganda and sending messages to other unneeded officials likewise feeding at the public trough.

Mr. President, I am about to conclude what I have to say in support of my amendment, but may I add—and this is surprising—that recently there was revealed another vivid example of the absurd lengths to which civil defense officials will go in wasting taxpayers' money. In his testimony last April before the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, Assistant Secretary of Defense Alain C. Enthoven testified that among the current proposals of the Joint Chiefs of Staff which, I am glad to say, has been denied to date by the Bureau of the Budget was a request for a shelter program for protection of U.S.-based military personnel and their dependents against nuclear attack. I do not know whether they propose this as a defense against a possible nuclear attack from Communist China or from the Soviet Union, but the proposal they made was to cost \$191 million over the next 5-year period. Taxpayers can certainly be thankful that Budget Bureau officials denied this request. Of course, the request will be renewed next year. I hope they will continue to deny it. However, it is a certainty that it will be among those items sought next year or in succeeding

years. If the past is any guide to the future, it will in all probability slip through one of these years with little notice and in the guise of a defense appropriation and come before the Senate for a vote in the closing days of a session when we are hurrying toward a much-hoped-for adjournment.

Of course, this entire proposal is as meaningless and foolish as other civil defense fallout shelter schemes over the years. However, it is important to relate because it depicts the insidious means by which the philosophy of despair and defeatism perpetrated by civil defense officials, willingly or unwillingly, pervades the thinking of the Department of Defense. If by adopting my amendment we serve notice that the Congress will no longer tolerate this indiscriminate use of taxpayers' money, we will help to bring about an end to such foolish, wasteful, and shortsighted planning.

Instead of spending additional millions of dollars for foolish holes in the ground, instead of bemusing ourselves with the cruel nonsense of shelters, we should be spending this money to cure social evils that have afflicted our Nation here at home and to forge links of peace with the peoples throughout the world.

Mr. President, by adopting my amendment, \$10,600,000 will be saved without in any way impairing our national security or vital public services. I know that we will probably hear the old argument that the civil defense budget amounts to but a fraction of 1 percent of the total defense budget. However, translated into dollars, this percentage exceeds \$60 million this year—a huge sum of money that could be diverted to essential programs such as the model cities program, for eradication of rats from our cities and for other needed programs for the welfare of millions of Americans.

Mr. President, here is one place where we can practice real economy if we are sincerely interested in eliminating non-essential Federal spending. I urge that my amendment be adopted.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a great deal can be said about whether we should have civil defense or not. I think a great bulk of Americans believe in it and want it carried on and financed.

We have gradually cut the appropriations for civil defense. Last year it was \$66 million for operation and maintenance. The estimates this year were for \$55 million. We added \$600,000 after receiving a great deal of testimony and cut the budget \$6,560,000. We thought that was cut to the bone and would barely provide enough with which to operate. They do not always operate only in the field of civil defense. They also take part in all of the disasters and other occurrences, such as tornadoes, floods, fires, and other disasters.

On research, shelters, and survey, we have cut the amount every year. We are reaching the point now where about all we have to do is to give them sufficient money to maintain the present research and shelter service and the marking of new places that may be built. And for a continuing effort on it, we have reached about the point where next year

they will have marked all of the places—that can be marked for this purpose.

I think this cut would seriously handicap this work. We have cut them and cut them, and they are down now to where they can just about keep up with their bare program in cooperation with the local communities.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in closing my argument and refuting the statement just made by the distinguished senior Senator from Washington, I desire to point out again that the House of Representatives considered this legislative proposal, and the Senate Committee on Appropriations has not accepted the reductions made in the House of Representatives, but has added \$5 million for shelters and marking and an additional \$600,000 for operations and maintenance. There is a total appropriation of \$63 million. This is \$5.6 million more than the amount passed in the House of Representatives.

I think it was a grave mistake even to grant the amount approved by the House of Representatives. I certainly feel that my modest amendment should be agreed to, particularly in view of the fact that the Senate committee increased this outrageous boondoggle by \$5.6 million this fiscal year, at a time when there is a crying need for economy in Government.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I think the record should be complete. And I think the Senator from Ohio would be very happy to have it complete.

In 1963 we appropriated for operations and maintenance \$75 million. It has gone down every year and is \$48 million this year. It is \$18 million below last year, and \$17 million below the budget. The cut is 13 percent.

Research, shelter survey, and marking started out as high as \$53 million in 1963. It has gone down to \$15 million this year, which is a cut under last year of \$5 million. The cut is 25 percent under last year, and a little more than that under the budget. So, the committee has done a very good job.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAYH (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE] is absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea" and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 54, as follows:

[No. 219 Leg.]

YEAS—27

Bible	Hatfield	Nelson
Boggs	Jordan, Idaho	Proxmire
Brewster	McGovern	Smathers
Burdick	McIntyre	Symington
Byrd, Va.	Metcalf	Tydings
Carlson	Montoya	Williams, N.J.
Church	Morse	Williams, Del.
Gruening	Moss	Yarborough
Hartke	Mundt	Young, Ohio

NAYS—54

Aiken	Fong	Miller
Allott	Gore	Monroney
Anderson	Griffin	Morton
Baker	Hansen	Muskie
Brooke	Hart	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Hayden	Pearson
Cannon	Hill	Pell
Case	Holland	Ribicoff
Cooper	Hollings	Russell
Cotton	Hruska	Scott
Curtis	Jackson	Smith
Dirksen	Javits	Sparkman
Dodd	Jordan, N.C.	Spong
Dominick	Kuchel	Stennis
Eastland	Long, La.	Talmadge
Ellender	Magnuson	Thurmond
Ervin	McClellan	Tower
Fannin	McGee	Young, N. Dak.

PRESENT AND GIVING A LIVE PAIR, AS PREVIOUSLY RECORDED—1

Bayh, for.

NOT VOTING—17

Bartlett	Inouye	Mondale
Bennett	Kennedy	Murphy
Clark	Lausche	Percy
Fulbright	Long, Mo.	Prouty
Harris	Mansfield	Randolph
Hickenlooper	McCarthy	

So the amendment of Mr. YOUNG of Ohio was rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all time on further amendments be limited to 20 minutes on each side, including committee amendments; that the time on committee amendments be under the control of the manager of the bill, the

Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]; and that the time on other amendments be equally divided and under the control of the mover of the amendment and the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, later reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That during the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 17023), making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, debate on any amendment, including committee amendments shall be limited to 40 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. The time on committee amendments shall be divided and controlled by the Senators from Colorado and Washington [Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. MAGNUSON] respectively.

AMENDMENT NO. 892

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up my amendment (No. 892), and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 33, line 21, insert the following: "\$55,000,000" in lieu of "\$38,838,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama?

The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, as I understand, the time limitation is 20 minutes to a side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] be added as a cosponsor of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

How much time does the Senator from Alabama yield to himself?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in offering this amendment, I am asking that the full amount be restored that the department requested. This proposal relates to planning money under section 701 of the National Housing Act.

I have discussed this matter with the chairman of the committee and also the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. It is my understanding that those gentlemen are willing to go along provided the amount is set at \$47.5 million in lieu of \$55 million.

I did not discuss that matter with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAG-

NUSON], but I did discuss it with the Senator from Colorado and he has agreed to the change.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I might say to the distinguished Senator from Alabama that I would be glad to join with the Senator from Colorado in accepting the proposal because I originally thought the amount should have been higher.

I do not think there should be any suggestion that the committee is against urban planning grants.

While the \$38.8 million provided in the committee bill is the same as that allowed by the House, this was the maximum amount the House was authorized to provide. Since that time additional authority has been provided in S. 3794 as passed by the Senate on May 28 and also by the House on July 10 and is now pending before a conference committee.

This is an extremely popular program faced with very heavy demand from local communities, State governments and metropolitan areawide groups. It should be pointed out that \$38.8 million is actually a decrease from the fiscal year 1968 program level of \$45 million.

If it is our desire to continue good comprehensive planning and to provide encouragement to State and local efforts toward achieving this end, then some restoration certainly is in order. I, personally, would be more willing to take this amendment to conference.

It is urgent that we do something about the matter.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Washington. I did not intend to be critical of the committee. I knew the circumstances under which the committee did its work.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Would the Senator explain what this additional money would do?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The housing bill passed last year provided that a new category be authorized in areas outside of the metropolitan area. Section 701 is the planning program, and it applies to urban areas, but there are many rural areas and smaller towns that need this planning just as much as the urban areas. We extended it this year on a district basis and this additional money is asked for to take care of those areas.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There are many small communities that might be on the periphery of an urban area and we think this provision will encourage more regional planning.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 2 minutes?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Alabama and thank him for the privilege of cosponsoring this amendment; and I wish to express my appreciation to the man-

ager of the bill for accepting the proposal in this fashion. I had planned to support the Senator from Alabama in the debate but it has become unnecessary.

Mr. President, I express to the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] my admiration for his very capable handling of H.R. 17023, the Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill of 1969. Chairman MAGNUSON has done a most effective job and brings to us a bill that is greatly improved over the one that came to us from the House.

Of considerable importance to my State and to the entire Nation are the appropriations for various programs administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Of particular concern to me and to my State is the appropriation in this bill for urban planning grants, generally known as the "701" program.

Under this very worthy program HUD makes available to local and State governments financial assistance to help them plan orderly urban growth. Never before has planning been so necessary as now, when our burgeoning urban centers are striving to cope with monumental economic and social problems.

During the next 30 years the U.S. population is expected to increase to about 300 million people. More than 275 million of these people are expected to reside in urban areas. The land covered by urban development will double during this period. There are few Americans today who are not daily exposed to the great problems of an expanding urban population—problems of overcrowding, frustrating traffic jam, diminishing open space, suffocating air pollution, and so forth.

According to the 1960 census, 73.7 percent of all Texans lived in urban places. This is up from 60.5 percent in 1950, and 45.4 percent in 1940. Urban places in Texas can expect continued population expansion and continued problems associated with urban growth. In my State in 1960 there were a total of 320 places of 2,500 or more population—299 of those had a population of under 50,000 people. If the governments of these localities are to cope responsibly with the problems of their continuing urbanization, then we must not deprive them of funds to plan.

One need not travel to New York City, to Washington, D.C., to Los Angeles, or even to Houston, Tex., to experience the problems of disorderly urban growth. Urban problems are just as prevalent, though on a smaller scale, in any middle-sized city of 10,000, 20,000, or 50,000 people. The only difference is that our smaller cities still have time to meet the crisis—they still have time to plan an orderly urban growth.

The 701 program up to the present point has been oriented toward planning and development problems of urban areas and individual rural counties and small cities. S. 3497, the pending housing act now in conference committee, authorizes a new category of assistance to multi-county districts outside metropolitan areas.

This is extremely important in my

State, where many counties continue to lose population to our urban centers. From 1950 to 1960, 142 of the 254 counties in Texas lost population—that is over half—56 percent—of our counties. These areas, too, need comprehensive planning to determine their future role in an urbanizing world.

The new authorization for these multi-county, nonmetropolitan districts, will permit the pooling of scarce planning and public administration talent for a coordinated attack on deficiencies in services to rural communities and a concerted effort for development of resources in these areas. The new district planning will help better utilize the tremendous human and economic investment in rural areas and help stem the tide of migration to congested cities.

If the crisis of the city is to be met, we must begin to plan today, not only in the megalopolis, but in our smaller cities and our rural areas as well.

This planning is the purpose of the urban planning grants, initiated by section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954. This year the "701" budget request was for \$55 million—a very conservative request considering that at the \$55 million level only about half of the applications for fiscal year 1969 assistance can be funded. Yet we have before us now a recommendation from the Appropriations Committee of \$38.8 million for "701" grants. This is \$16.2 million below the amount that I consider necessary to meet at least our minimal commitment to these local governments.

We cannot afford to throttle State and local planning efforts for urban growth. The problems dealt with by these planning programs will not wait. The price of planning is microscopic compared to the sums which can be saved through the efficient development and orderly growth that comes of planning.

The distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], whose leadership in the field of urban development is well-known and widely admired, has sponsored an amendment to restore \$16.2 million to the "701" program.

It is my pleasure to cosponsor this needed amendment by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], which will bring HUD's program of urban planning grants up to the budget request of \$55 million. I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support this worthy amendment.

I have received from my State a great deal of correspondence documenting the importance of full funding for these programs. As an indication of the need felt in Texas for urban planning grants, I ask unanimous consent that telegrams to me from Mr. Leslie G. Smyth, of the El Paso, Tex., Council of Governments; from Mayor George Boyce, of Mesquite, Tex., who serves as president of the North Central Texas Council of Governments; and from Mr. Ed Danile, of the North Texas Regional Planning Commission, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EL PASO, TEX.,
July 15, 1968.

Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:
Urge amendment of housing bill of 1968 to
raise 701 appropriation to 55,000,000. Re-
gional planning contingent on HUD assist-
ance.

LESLIE G. SMYTH,
Executive Director, El Paso Council of
Governments.

ARLINGTON, TEX.,
July 9, 1968.

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Senate Appropriations Committee,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I understand that HUD "701" appropria-
tions for urban planning assistance to local
governments may be cut to \$38.8 million. We
feel that this is a vital program which has
contributed to their capability to deal with
social economics and physical problems of
greater Dallas and Ft. Worth metropolitan
region. In behalf of the 110 cities, counties,
school districts, and special districts who
are members of North Central Texas Council
of Governments, I strongly urge and rec-
ommend appropriations of the originally pro-
posed \$55 million for this important pro-
gram. Thank you for your help. It is greatly
appreciated.

MAYOR GEORGE BOYCE,
City of Mesquite, President of North
Central Texas Council of Governments.

WICHITA FALLS, TEX.,

RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge your support for reinstating section
204 review process in House version of hous-
ing bill of 1968. Section 204 has been very
effective in cooperation of cities and counties
in our area have been able to eliminate
duplication and construction of inadequate
facilities when reviewed by area wide agency
composed of elected officials. Also appreciate
consideration of reinstating appropriation
act of 701 planning fund.

ED DANILE,
Executive Director, Nortex Regional
Planning Commission.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I
modify my amendment, in lieu of the
figure "\$55,000,000", insert the figure
"\$47,500,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The
amendment is so modified.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am
pleased to join the distinguished Senator
from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who is
the able and respected chairman of the
Committee on Banking and Currency,
in sponsoring the pending amendment.
Our amendment would increase the ap-
propriation for the urban planning
assistance program, the so-called 701
program, from \$38.8 million to \$47.5
million.

As a member of the Pennsylvania State
Planning Board, I have acquired a keen
appreciation of the value of the 701 pro-
gram. The board, partly with assistance
of 701 funds, is now preparing a state-
wide comprehensive development plan
for the Commonwealth.

The 701 program is very important to
State and local governments throughout
the Nation as well as in Pennsylvania. Ef-
fective planning and action require sta-
bility in the continuity of the 701 pro-
gram. This appropriation is one of the
most useful investments we can make in
dealing with the problems of our cities
and urban regions.

For these reasons, I urge adoption of
the amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield
back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I
yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The ques-
tion is on agreeing to the amendment of
the Senator from Alabama, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was
agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, we
passed over temporarily another item in
NASA which involves the amendment
on construction and facilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk
will state the amendment.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On
page 20, line 19, strike out "\$21,800,000"
and insert in lieu thereof "\$34,750,000".

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr.
President, will the Senator from Colorado
yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield 3
minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sena-
tor from Delaware is recognized for 3
minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. Pres-
ident, the Senate has already rejected an
amendment proposed by me which would
have cut the space program by approxi-
mately \$300 million below the House fig-
ure. The pending committee amendment
now goes in the other direction and would
increase the House allowance from \$21-
800,000, to \$34,750,000, an increase of \$13
million.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the
amendment, and I shall be ready to vote.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr.
President, I merely point out that there
are other proposals in the bill, as well as
in bills to come, which many Senators
feel are much more important and
should have a higher priority than some
of the space programs. As I said, we
have already decided that we do not
want to cut below the House figure.

The question now is: Do we want to
expand it beyond the House figure?

I believe it would be most unwise to do
so, and I therefore hope that the amend-
ment will be rejected.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield
myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sena-
tor from Colorado is recognized for 2
minutes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the prin-
ciple of this amendment is the same as
we discussed on research and develop-
ment. What has been brought out here
is that there is a total of about \$4 bil-
lion in plant and equipment investments
in space. It takes, and it will continue to
take this amount to keep it up and on-
going in conformity with the rest of
the program.

I think it is also appropriate to invite
attention at this time to the fact that
the figure is a cut of about 30 percent
below the budget estimate.

I urge that the Senate support the
committee on this basis and adopt the
committee amendment.

Mr. President, I yield back the re-
mainder of my time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I
yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time
has now been yielded back. The question
is on agreeing to the committee amend-
ment.

On this question the yeas and nays
have been ordered, and the clerk will call
the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk pro-
ceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PELL (after having voted in the
negative). On this vote I have a pair
with the distinguished Senator from
West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. If he
were present and voting, he would vote
"yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I
would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I an-
nounce that the Senator from Alaska
[Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Penn-
sylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from
Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator
from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the
Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS],
the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN],
the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr.
KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr.
LAUSCHE], the Senator from Missouri
[Mr. LONG], the Senator from Montana
[Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Min-
nesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator
from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Sen-
ator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH],
the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL],
and the Senator from Florida [Mr.
SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from
Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] is absent on offi-
cial business.

I further announce that, if present and
voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr.
BARTLETT], the Senator from Pennsyl-
vania [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from
Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] would each vote
"nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisi-
ana [Mr. ELLENDER] is paired with the
Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If
present and voting, the Senator from
Louisiana would vote "yea" and the Sena-
tor from Georgia would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the
Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the
Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the
Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY],
the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY],
and the Senator from Vermont [Mr.
PROUTY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKEN-
LOOPER] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from
Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] and the Senator
from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] would each
vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Cali-
fornia [Mr. MURPHY] is paired with the
Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. If
present and voting, the Senator from
California would vote "yea," and the
Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 42,
nays 34, as follows:

[No. 220 Leg.]

YEAS—42

Alken	Eastland	Jordan, Idaho
Allott	Ervin	Kuchel
Anderson	Fong	Long, La.
Bible	Hartke	Magnuson
Byrd, Va.	Hill	McClellan
Byrd, W. Va.	Holland	McGee
Cannon	Hruska	McIntyre
Dirksen	Jackson	Monroney
Dodd	Jordan, N.C.	Montoya

Morse
Mundt
Muskie
Pastore
Scott

Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Thurmond
NAYS—34

Tower
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

Baker
Bayh
Boggs
Brewster
Brooke
Burdick
Carlson
Case
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis

Dominick
Fannin
Gore
Griffin
Gruening
Hansen
Hart
Hollings
Javits
McGovern
Metcalf
Miller

Morton
Moss
Nelson
Pearson
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Symington
Talmadge
Tydings
Williams, Del.

PRESENT AND GIVING A LIVE PAIR, AS
PREVIOUSLY RECORDED—1

Pell, against.

NOT VOTING—22

Bartlett
Bennett
Clark
Ellender
Fulbright
Harris
Hatfield
Hayden

Hickenlooper
Inouye
Kennedy
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Mansfield
McCarthy
Mondale

Murphy
Percy
Prouty
Randolph
Russell
Smathers

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 30, line 20, strike "\$48,040,000," and insert "\$48,640,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On Page 31, line 3, strike "\$18,500,000," and insert "\$19,100,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 31, line 10, strike "\$10,000,000," and insert "\$15,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The assistant legislative clerk read the next amendment, as follows:

On page 33, beginning on line 1, insert the following new language:

"URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAMS

"For grants for urban renewal, fiscal year 1970, as an additional amount for urban renewal programs, as authorized by title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1450 et seq.) and section 314 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1452a), \$1,300,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation in this Act shall be used for administrative expenses in connection with commitments for grants aggregating more than the total of amounts available in the current year from the amounts authorized for making such commitments through June 30, 1968, plus the additional amounts appropriated therefor."

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 33, line 6, strike the figure "\$1,300,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "\$1,250,000,000."

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I am not unaware—nor, I am sure, is any other Senator—of the problems of our cities.

The House of Representatives did not consider this item at all, because at the time they considered the appropriation bill, the authorization bill had not passed.

The amount of the authorization is \$1.4 billion.

Senators should remember, in considering this matter, that we are not appropriating for fiscal year 1969, but for fiscal year 1970; so the figure that I have offered here, which is \$1,250 million, is the same amount that is available for urban renewal during the coming year.

If the fiscal situation of the country improves, so that we can afford it, I know that we will receive additional requests for items of this type; but I think this is a time when we should tighten our belts and retrench somewhat. I do not think this is an unreasonable amount by which to cut this item, and I am sure they can make do with it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am inclined to agree with the Senator from Colorado. I would like personally to have had the \$1,400 million, for the reasons he has mentioned, but I do appreciate that this is a matter which the House of Representatives has not fully considered. It is about as close to the authorization as we can get, I am sure, and I think the Senate, in approving this amount and standing firm on it in conference, will probably have the agreement of the House of Representatives, because it shows we are cutting quite a bit from the full amount authorized.

Title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, authorized Federal assistance to local public agencies for rehabilitation and/or acquisition, clearance, and redevelopment of slums and blighted areas. The urban renewal program provides technical and financial resources to stimulate programs of economic and social action in furthering the objectives of revitalizing urban communities.

The committee recognized the need for providing advance appropriations for this program since advance knowledge of program levels is of great importance in the administration of urban renewal activities. Assurance that Federal funds and technical services will be available to supplement efforts of private enterprise and local governments is essential in order to attract large sums of private capital for investment in slum areas. The appropriation includes funds for both the regular title I program, as well as for assistance in model cities areas. The committee feels that the combining of these funds into one appropriation is desirable since most of the physical treatment of model neighborhood areas will be through the renewal process.

The House deferred this item pending enactment of authorizing legislation

which has since been provided for in the Senate-passed bill, S. 3497. The committee recognized that the urban renewal program is the principal tool available to cities and counties faced with the complex problems of slums and blight and their accompanying economic and social decay.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this is a matter of deep interest to the cities. I represent the largest of our cities; other Senators represent the others.

Housing is a critical and integral part of what we are trying to do to improve conditions in the slums and ghettos of America, which are causing such concern to all our people. We had quite a go-around about this matter in the committee. I thought that the figure which had been settled upon represented a reasonable meeting of the minds; and though I, like the Senator from Washington, fought for and voted for \$1,400 million, and I am rather disheartened by the fact that the \$1,300 million, which I thought represented a reasonable consensus of opinion, has not proved agreeable to all the committee members, I agree that Senator MAGNUSON's judgment is probably correct; and that when we get into figures of this magnitude, it is difficult to hold a bill in balance, and there are other items of vital importance to the cities which we shall come to in due course.

I believe it would probably be unwise, much as I differ with the Senator from Colorado, to challenge the judgment of the chairman on this particular item, considering the percentage of the \$1,300 million which is involved. Much as I deplore the reduction, therefore, I personally will accept the judgment of the chairman.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator. As I say, this is advanced funding for 1970. They have to make plans, and if conditions change somewhat, I think we can easily meet legitimate demands as we move along.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the chairman yield further?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The chairman said something critically important in respect to standing by this item in conference. Can we count upon the fact that the chairman will continue to feel that this item has now really been pared to the bone, and that he and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the ranking minority member, will, in conference, in all good faith, make every effort to retain, if it is at all possible, this figure?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I would like to see the Senate figure stand fast in conference.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

I do not think anyone doubts for a moment that the Senator from New York, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and others feel very strongly that the full budget figure should be in this bill. I personally feel we will be in a stronger position with the adoption of

this amendment than we would be otherwise, and I assure the Senator from New York, for my own part, as the chairman has assured him, that we will stand by it in conference.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE. I appreciate the assurance which the chairman and the ranking minority member have given. Like the Senator from New York, I shall not challenge their judgment, on the basis of these assurances, which I appreciate.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have spoken already in support of full funding for HUD's program of urban planning grants. I cosponsored Senator Sparkman's amendment to restore that valuable program to the full \$55 million that had been requested by the administration.

There are two other major programs in this appropriation bill (H.R. 17023) that are of special interest to me, and I wish to indicate my support for them.

I was extremely pleased that the Senate committee saw fit to restore to \$500 million the appropriation for the model cities programs, which had been cut to \$400 million by the House. This is a very worthy program that promises to contribute a great deal toward the solution of the urban crisis. It deserves full funding.

Similarly, I am pleased to support the restoration of \$40 million to the rent supplement program, which means so much to our low income citizens. By restoring this appropriation to its full \$65 million level, we will be able to provide in 1969 some 72,200 supplemental units, which are a vital part of the President's 10-year housing program.

It is my hope that when we go to conference with the House on this appropriation bill, the Senate position on these two items will prevail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do the Senators yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All the time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The assistant legislative clerk read the next amendment, as follows:

On page 35, line 7, strike "\$100,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$500,000,000".

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, so we will not again get into a parliamentary misunderstanding, I move the adoption of the committee amendment on page 35, lines 7 and 8.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the

Senator withhold that motion for a moment, so that I may offer a suggestion?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator that the amendment must be pending, because there is a time limitation. The amendment of the Senator from Washington now is pending as the committee amendment, and the time is controlled.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Iowa whatever time he wishes.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. How much time does the Senator wish?

Mr. MILLER. Two minutes.

Mr. President, the amendment on line 8, of which the Senator from Washington has now moved the adoption, ties in with the amendment on line 13. I had planned to offer an amendment to the amendment on line 13; and, depending upon the action by the Senate on that amendment, or the Senate action on the question of agreeing to the committee amendment, the figure on line 8 will rise or fall, or be varied.

So I should like to suggest to the Senator from Washington that he withdraw his motion and take up and move the adoption of the amendment on line 13, which then will give me an opportunity to offer my amendment. Otherwise, I am afraid we will get into a tangle.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute. I have an amendment which I intend to offer, which is an amendment to both lines 8 and 13.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, perhaps my friend from Colorado and I can collaborate on the matter. Would the Senator from Washington mind if we suggested the absence of a quorum for a moment?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment on behalf of myself, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 35, lines 8 and 13, insert the following:

Line 8: Strike "\$500,000,000", insert "\$375,000,000".

Line 13: Strike "\$1,000,000,000", insert "\$750,000,000".

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the model cities program has been underway now for over a year, and last year we appropriated \$200 million for this purpose. So far, there has not been a penny of that money obligated by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

I say to my friends, particularly to those who represent large cities—and I represent one fairly good sized one—that I realize how important this matter is to them. However, as I said on this same subject last year, they would not have \$50 million of it obligated by the first of May. And we are now past the first of July, and not a single penny of it is obligated. And the reason is that by the time they get these plans presented and approved and finally make a grant, we have covered a long period of time. This money, of course, is for this year. So, the \$200 million that was provided here last year is now available. It has not been obligated and they have that money to go on.

If we were to appropriate the \$1 billion contained in the pending bill—the Senate committee, I must say frankly, adopted, I believe, by a vote of approximately 13 to 8—they would have the \$200 million plus the additional \$1 billion. I think this would be taking the program too far and too hard.

What would happen? The practical effect of my amendment, so everyone will understand, is that there would be \$750 million in the model cities program, a program that me financed at the level of \$200 million last year.

The sum of \$375 million, or half of the \$750 million, would be an urban renewal add-on as a part of the model cities program, and \$375 million would be a model cities program.

I know how many people feel on this matter. However, I also know and feel that we have expanded this program tremendously this year.

I think it is a very generous figure. I know that a great deal can be handled within it, and I would hope that the Senate would see fit to go along with these figures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I moved the adoption, first on page 35, line 7, of the committee amendment, which is \$500 million—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct as far as he has stated it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And, en bloc, I also moved the adoption, on line 13 of the committee amendment, \$1 billion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. Those amendments are being considered en bloc.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Colorado is a substitute to my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. So that if the vote is aye, it would carry out the figures recommended by the Senator from Colorado. And a nay vote would reject those figures. A vote would then come on the committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of confusion over the composition of the President's request for \$1 billion for the model cities program. I think that maybe I can help to clarify this with a few simple references.

There are two principal elements of the \$1 billion. First, \$500 million is for urban renewal projects within the model city areas, but only when they are part of an approved plan. Usually, this is called the urban renewal add-on amount. In other words, it is urban renewal within the model city, and not the urban renewal that could be in any city. This would have to be within the model city.

Second, there is \$500 million for supplementary grants. I think they would be called program grants. This is the full amount authorized by Congress in the 1966 act for this purpose for the fiscal year 1969. This has been authorized.

There have been, as I recall, 75 cities selected on what is called the first round of model cities, and there are requests for planning grants to over 160 other cities. That would be what are called the second round of grants to the cities that will be selected. And this was the full amount authorized by Congress for fiscal year 1969.

Part of the confusion arises because of the \$500 million request for urban renewal. Only \$150 million was pursuant to enacted authorization, while \$350 million was dependent upon the enactment of additional authorizing legislation which is now in conference and has not been completed. This has now passed both Houses. It is nearly authorized.

Mr. President, I have before me a tabulation which shows the basic elements of the President's budget request. It shows the President's budget recommendation, the action in the House, and the Senate committee bill. I ask unanimous consent that this tabulation be made a part of my remarks in the RECORD of these proceedings.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FISCAL YEAR 1969 BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR MODEL CITIES PROGRAMS

[In thousands of dollars]

	President's budget recom- mendation	House bill	Senate committee bill
Urban renewal grants in model cities areas:			
Under existing authorization....	\$150,000	\$100,000	\$150,000
Under proposed authorization....	350,000	-----	350,000
Subtotal, urban renewal....	500,000	100,000	500,000
Supplementary grants for model cities programs: Under existing authoriza- tion.....	500,000	400,000	500,000
Total appro- priation.....	1,000,000	500,000	1,000,000

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the whole question before the Senate is to determine whether this important program—which includes model cities which has had great response throughout the country and concerns our problems in the cities—we should proceed with the program in the amount of \$1 billion, which would include all urban renewal areas within the model cities, or whether under the Allott amendment we would proceed in both items, \$375 million each, or a total of \$750 million.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it seems to me that the key to this situation is how much self-improvement we want, rather than how much money the United States is going to devote to it.

The whole model city complex depends very heavily and very completely on reorganization—in many cases, new roads and new approaches in welfare, education, and other matters than housing in these respective cities.

The plea for renewal to which we responded in the committee by a majority vote was based upon the key point that unless we give the second round cities an opportunity to plan, we will cut down a number of the second round cities.

This is a very critical amendment. We do not even get off the ground with respect to the self-help feature, by virtue of cutting it.

That is why the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] led the committee so very wisely in the matter of restoration of funds to give an opportunity for new cities to come into the picture.

We will never know whether they could or could not engage in it and whether they were or were not worthy of the effort unless we provide the money so that they could be recognized and included in the model cities program.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And make this start. The committee recommends an increase in urban renewal add-on for model cities from \$100 million to \$500 million. The House deferred consideration of \$350 million of this item pending enactment

of authorizing legislation. This has since been provided in the Senate-passed bill, S. 3497 and in the bill H.R. 17989 which the other body passed.

Mr. President, I am pleased today to present a bill which contains the full \$1 billion request of the President for the model cities program. As you know, this program is the keystone of the Nation's concerted effort to renew and rehabilitate our vital urban centers. It is specifically designed to address the full range of human and physical needs that have been compounding in our cities across the land but which so often have only been partially met, or not met at all. The demand for these funds is great. Urban renewal will play a vital role in the model cities program because of the critical need for redevelopment and rehabilitation in the model neighborhoods. In order for the program to work, it is clear that urban renewal authorization must be provided in an adequate amount.

Furthermore, the cities must be able to plan for urban renewal at the same time that they plan for the total model cities' program. If urban renewal is delayed because no funds can be reserved for a city, then the whole model cities program is delayed, and this delay could be costly.

We have recommended \$500 million for supplementary grants for model cities programs which is \$100 million more than the House provided. The recommended increase takes advantage of the full authorization available.

The committee concurred with the request of the Department for these critically needed funds. We must appropriate these funds right now so that the cities can realistically identify and assign priorities, and make hard decisions on the kinds of programs that they can carry out with the funds available. The committee does not believe in making appropriations after the horse has left the barn. This program is designed to promote cool-headed, precision planning. Failure to appropriate the full \$500 million at this time would be a denial to the cities of our original intent for this program. These cities want to do their job and they want to do it well. We have to let them know, not only that we can be relied upon to fulfill our commitment, but we also have to give them a clear indication of what they can expect, in time for these funds to promote the highest quality model cities programs.

Mr. JAVITS. The administration considers this the most creative aspect of trying to do something about the slums and ghettos. I went along with carrying out normal urban renewal, the traditional program, at the present rate when Senator ALLOTT made his motion and Senator MAGNUSON accepted it.

Now, that is sort of a bread-and-butter operation, but this is the really creative aspect of trying to do something about the core cities. I hope the Senate will not accept this cut, because it will be inhibiting to the program which is ongoing and, even more important, to the opportunity for other cities to get themselves off the ground; and, considering

what they put into it, I believe it would be a wise and creative action by the Senate to allow this amount, as the committee has brought it in.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As the Senator from New York is aware, every person who has studied the incidents that have been occurring in the United States has put his finger immediately upon the environment. What is the environment?

This is the creative effort, which I believe is overdue, to at least make a start in this field. It coincides with the housing bill we have passed.

It seems to me that a billion dollars in this wide field, to make a start on what we believe we should do, is not excessive. Environment, I believe, is an important feature of much of the unrest. Frankly, I would do more, if I had my way.

Mr. JAVITS. Has not the Senator found that, of all the housing programs, this is the most popular with mayors, who have the heat on their backs every day, that this is the one they think can do the most for their city?

Mr. MAGNUSON. This is the one that gives them what they think is the real beginning of a promise to do something about it.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey such time as he wishes.

Mr. CASE. It will not take very long to make the point. The Senator from Washington and the Senator from New York have already made it.

I believe that the whole problem with the attack that the American people and we, as their representatives, have made on poverty and everything else that goes with it is that our attack has been so pitifully small. A billion dollars is just a drop in the bucket of the needs of the cities, as Mayor Lindsay, Governor Rockefeller, and many others have testified. As the Senators from Washington has just said, with his customary direct eloquence, for us to cut down this pitifully small amount at this time would be a great mistake.

Mr. JAVITS. May I add one point: Because of the way we run our budgets, this is an appropriation. But, actually, is there anything that adds more per dollar of value to the American capital plan and to the real financial worth of our country than this type of appropriation? Much of it comes back in taxes, in improved property values, in improved lives, which pay taxes. Because of the way we run our books, we call this an appropriation, as if we were spending. But, really, it represents a capital investment which should have a very high priority.

In voting on these amendments, I believe Senators should have that in mind, both in its human terms, as expressed by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] so eloquently, and in its pragmatic, financial terms, as adding to the national stock of wealth.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We have talked a great deal in the last few months about private participation in this field, and many of our businesses and our people have tried to respond, and this fits the hand in the glove. If they can have that

kind of place to do some of these things and create what they hope literally will be a more model city.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They cannot go into the ghettos and do the things they like to do unless the ghettos start to rehabilitate themselves. We have found that this is the only way to do it.

Mr. JAVITS. This is targeted directly at the core cities, where the real trouble is, and it is the one key appropriation with which we deal in HUD that is so targeted.

I hope, with the chairman of the subcommittee, that the Senate will reject the amendments.

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the Senator from Delaware such time as he requires.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this amendment should be adopted.

I sometimes marvel at the manner in which some of our members refer to \$1 billion as a pitiful amount. It is still quite a sizable sum when we are confronted with a \$25 billion deficit.

I invite attention to the fact that last year we appropriated \$537 million for the same program. This year the committee amendment would make it \$1 billion. The amendments of the Senator from Colorado, of which I am a cosponsor, would reduce this amount to \$750 million. Even if the pending amendments are adopted we would still be adding 40 percent more to this program than they had last year.

I believe it is well to ask ourselves how much more the American taxpayers can afford. Certainly it is not destroying a program when you increase it by 40 percent. The rejection of these amendments would mean that the amount would be practically double that of last year, and I do not believe we have the money with which to proceed on these programs at that rate.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I know how strongly the Senator from New York and the Senator from New Jersey feel about this matter.

I should like to point out one thing: It is no wonder that this is a popular program, because it takes care of 80 percent of the part cities put up for these programs. So in a program where the Federal Government is putting up 66⅔ percent under the model cities program, the Government will in turn put up 80 percent of the 33⅓ percent that remains.

I believe that any reasonable person should wonder if we should not go a little slowly. But, this is not going slowly. My amendments do not go slowly when we consider that we have \$200 million appropriated for fiscal year 1968 which has not even now been obligated. My amendments would give them \$750 million for 1969, of which \$375 million would be earmarked for urban renewal within the model cities.

I sincerely hope the amendments are adopted. Frankly, I believe it is as much as they can absorb and digest during this year; and I predict that unless they just accept these plans willy-nilly, this money will not be obligated by the end of this year.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. For clarification, would the Senator from Colorado let me know whether my understanding is correct?

As I visualize it, the House passed a total appropriation of \$500 million.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. The Senate committee made that \$1 billion, and the amendments of the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Delaware would make that appropriation \$750 million.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct. Of which \$375 million would be urban renewal within the model cities program.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I thank the Senator.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 2 minutes?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from New York 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. NELSON in the chair). The Senator from New York is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we have an admirable system in the Committee on Appropriations which is called the preparation of side slips. They are supposed to be quite objective, as all Members who serve on the Committee on Appropriations know.

I ask that Senators listen to this justification from these objective side slips. The side slips are not anything that I invented, assuming I have an interest in the cities. I do, and it is high time that everyone had an interest in the cities. I would like to read from page 176 of the side slips:

The program has called for an impressive local commitment. City and county officials have committed themselves to new approaches in solving city problems, possibly involving major changes in the way in which they organize and provide their services. Citizens' groups have been drawn upon and are responding to a requirement that they participate. Private industry has furnished substantial evidence of a willingness to join in city programs and to provide important contributions of resources and special skills. The full restoration of the estimate of \$500 million for supplementary grants is proposed to reflect firm and visible Federal support to these city efforts.

Then, they go over to page 177 and they say, in effect:

What we are asking here is for two things: First, that we have the amounts available to tell the cities what they should plan for, so that they can plan realistically and in terms of objectives which can be accomplished. Second, we need to have adequate funds available so that plans can be converted to action programs as rapidly as they are approved, and so that we can maintain the enthusiasm and the tempo which have been generated.

These are the directives we want to give American cities and it is in that context that we say a mayor is successful or dead on his feet.

Mr. President, this is the key argument. It is awful when in 2 minutes a critically important decision is taken, and on far less important matters we take days and days. There is involved

here the life and well-being of 70 percent of the American people.

I live in a very exclusive part of New York with my family, but it is only 10 blocks from one of the most depressed, difficult, crime-ridden, and undistinguished areas in the city. Every Senator here who lives in a big city is aware of the same situation. This approach is targeted in on the exact issue we face in this country.

I hope this important objective is realized and that we will not cut the amount.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. How much time is there remaining on each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington has 4 minutes remaining and the Senator from Colorado has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I very much dislike being on the opposite side of the position taken by my friend from Colorado. No member of the Committee on Appropriations works harder than he, and no member uses better judgment than he. I may be wrong in taking an opposition position than he has taken on this amendment, but I do.

Mr. President, there are many multi-billion dollar programs for the cities of the United States. There are so many that I am unable to keep track of all of them.

Inasmuch as I come from a rural area, I am often accused of being anticity because I vote against some exorbitant programs, but I do try to pick out worthwhile programs for cities, and I believe this is one of them.

Mr. President, I shall vote against the cut because I believe this is one of the better programs for the cities.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 1 minute so that I may thank the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is not often that we flatter each other in the routine and the tradition of the Senate, but I must tell the Senator from North Dakota that, as one child of the slums myself and knowing what it is to be immersed in the slums, I appreciate what he said.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to clear up the record. The Senator from New York quoted from what he called sideslips and he said that they were an impartial representation of the matter. Actually, they are not that. The part from which he read is the justification taken from the testimony of Dr. Weaver, the Secretary of HUD when he testified before the committee. Therefore, it is understandable why the glowing terms and words were used.

I am not flippant about this matter in any sense. I am just as aware of the

problem, although the Senator from New York would not believe it, as he is.

Last year we gave them \$200 million of which not one penny was obligated as of July 5. We do not know that this is the most imaginative program and we do not know what it will produce.

The Senator from Colorado believes in trying to go forward enough to give them \$750 million more, which would give them \$950 million, or almost \$1 billion to carry forward the model cities program. I think that is a generous amount and I believe it is a far more practical way to move the program.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I do not feel the Senator should say I do not believe he has deep feeling for the cities. I believe he does. We may disagree on the remedy because of the different frames of reference in which we operate and where we were born. I believe his heart is as good as mine or as good as any other Senator in the Chamber.

However, does not what he has proposed, with his passion for doing the job as economically as he can, negate his argument? The Senator would have no right to give us \$900 million if this were not a good program and if he did not think it were a good program. If he did not think so, he should cut it out entirely. The Senator from Colorado is a man of great conscience and he has not made his proposal because he likes me. We differ only in degree. The Senate should understand that.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am happy that we differ only in degree. I do not know what the Senator knows about my background so he can compare our backgrounds.

We have been told over and over again that this is a wonderful program. We do not know. Giving them \$950 million during this year to find out if it is a workable program is not being ungenerous.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, it has been almost 20 years since the Congress of the United States promised a decent home and a decent environment for every American family. Yet when we look at our national housing supply, both in the cities and in the rural areas, we find this not to be the case.

Many have explained why this has happened. They have told us about the difficulties of modernizing the home-building industry.

They have explained how the high cost of land works against a satisfactory housing supply.

They have told us of labor problems, tax problems and zoning problems.

But there is another problem that we in the Congress must face, a problem we cannot ignore. It is the simple fact that we cannot build housing without money—and a congressional promise without a satisfactory appropriation is an empty promise.

That is why I appeal to my colleagues today in behalf of the so-called urban renewal "add-on" funds that are such a vital part of the model cities program.

Like many Senators, I have been critical of our urban renewal programs over the years. Such criticism formed an im-

portant part of the hearings the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization held on the Federal role in urban affairs.

But this criticism was intended to improve, not to destroy, the urban renewal program. It was meant to make the urban renewal program more responsive to the needs of the people who must have good housing and good neighborhoods.

Now we have the framework within which urban renewal can accomplish the job that we always wanted it to accomplish. That framework is the model cities program.

But the model cities approach cannot succeed without necessary financial support.

In my State of Connecticut, for example, it is vitally important that the model cities program be continued—and expanded.

Three communities—New Haven, Hartford, and Bridgeport—have made great progress in planning their model cities programs. But it is essential that they be allowed to continue their efforts—that is, to turn their plans into reality.

In turn, seven more cities—Danbury, New London, Norwalk, Stamford, Waterbury, West Haven, and Willimantic—are applying for model cities funds.

These communities, like other cities all over America, have made a fine start. But, if they are to achieve success, they must have adequate support from the Federal Government.

Our cities need our help. They are demonstrating the kind of local initiative so important for progress. We must not let them down.

The model cities program gives our cities the first real opportunity to combat their slums and blight in the only manner in which they can successfully be eliminated. That manner is through locally developed and executed programs.

Model cities programs enable cities to coordinate all of their local resources, both public and private, with State and Federal assistance, in a combined, massive assault on all problems of slum living—substandard housing, poor education, ill health, unemployment, and illiteracy.

We must provide full funding for model cities.

To do less would force many cities to scale down—or even to abandon—their efforts.

In model cities, we have the opportunity to make a constructive contribution to the health of urban America.

It is an opportunity we can ill afford to pass by. I urge that we vote the full appropriation of \$1 billion.

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, we are now voting on the Allott-Williams-Miller amendment to make this amount \$750 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As a substitute for the committee amendment,

Mr. PASTORE. A vote "aye" would be for a reduction in Model Cities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea," and the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 54, as follows:

[No. 221 Leg.]

YEAS—21

Allott	Ervin	McClellan
Bible	Fannin	Miller
Byrd, Va.	Hansen	Mundt
Curtis	Holland	Smith
Dirksen	Hruska	Thurmond
Dominick	Jordan, N.C.	Tower
Eastland	Jordan, Idaho	Williams, Del.

NAYS—54

Alken	Griffin	Muskie
Anderson	Gruening	Nelson
Baker	Hart	Pastore
Bayh	Hartke	Pearson
Boggs	Hill	Pell
Brewster	Jackson	Proxmire
Brooke	Javits	Ribicoff
Burdick	Kuchel	Scott
Byrd, W. Va.	Long, La.	Sparkman
Cannon	Magnuson	Spong
Case	McGee	Stennis
Church	McGovern	Symington
Cooper	McIntyre	Talmadge
Cotton	Metcalf	Tydings
Dodd	Monroney	Williams, N.J.
Ellender	Montoya	Yarborough
Fong	Morse	Young, N. Dak.
Gore	Moss	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—24

Bartlett	Hickenlooper	Mondale
Bennett	Hollings	Morton
Carlson	Inouye	Murphy
Clark	Kennedy	Percy
Fulbright	Lausche	Prouty
Harris	Long, Mo.	Randolph
Hatfield	Mansfield	Russell
Hayden	McCarthy	Smathers

So Mr. ALLOTT's amendments were rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the committee amendments en bloc on page 35, lines 7 and 8, to strike out "\$100,000,000" and insert "\$500,000,000," and on lines 12 and 13, to strike out "\$500,000,000" and insert "1,000,000,000."

The amendments were agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The legislative clerk read the committee amendment on page 35, lines 16 through 19, as follows:

URBAN INFORMATION AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

For grants authorized by title IX of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (80 Stat. 1282-1284), \$2,500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk. Page 37, line 17, strike out "\$25,000,000" and insert "\$65,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Was the committee amendment on line 12, page 36, passed on? I did not hear it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That amendment had been agreed to previously.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the bill. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 74, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 222 Leg.]

YEAS—74

Alken	Baker	Boggs
Allott	Bayh	Brewster
Anderson	Bible	Brooke

Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Gore
Griffin
Gruening
Hansen
Hart

Hartke
Holland
Hruska
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Long, La.
Magnuson
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Mundt
Muskie

Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—25

Bartlett
Bennett
Carlson
Clark
Fulbright
Harris
Hatfield
Hayden
Hickenlooper

Hill
Hollings
Inouye
Kennedy
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Mansfield
McCarthy
Mondale

Morton
Murphy
Percy
Prouty
Randolph
Russell
Smathers

So the bill (H.R. 17023) was passed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ALLOTT, Mrs. SMITH, and Mr. HRUSKA conferees on the part of the Senate.

TRANSFER OF HEADSTART PROGRAM TO THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have in my hand a very interesting letter, which I shall read into the RECORD. It is on the stationery of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C. It is dated July 17, 1968, signed by the Acting Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Bertrand M. Harding, and reads as follows:

Memorandum for: All OEO employees.
Subject: Proposed Transfer of Headstart.

The Senate today voted to transfer Head Start to the Office of Education effective July 1, 1969 over the strong objections of this Office, the Office of Education and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

I believe this is most harmful to a coordinated approach to the problems of poverty. Such action, taken without hearings or full discussions, does not provide the proper safeguards to insure dedication of the program to the best interests of the poor. For this reason, we will continue to oppose this action with all the means available to us.

I will continue to keep you informed of new developments.

BERTRAND M. HARDING,
Acting Director.

Mr. President, the Senate of the United States yesterday, by a vote of 60 to 29, voted to transfer Headstart, effective in 1970, to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with the administrative jurisdiction vested in the Commissioner of Education.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is replete with the reasons for the transfer. The members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare knew before the vocational education bill ever left the committee that the Senator from Colorado would make his motion to make the transfer.

A year ago, Mr. President, extensive hearings were held on the matter. This year there was considerable discussion of the subject and that was all brought out in the debate yesterday.

What is interesting, Mr. President, is the presumptuousness of the Acting Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity in this propaganda letter of his to all the employees of the OEO.

In my many years in the Senate, I have observed a good many examples of Government officials who have suffered lapses of good judgment, and I give Mr. Harding the benefit of the doubt in assuming he is capable of good judgment, and only lapsing in respect to it now and then; but this letter shows that Mr. Harding is not aware of the rights and prerogatives and duties of the Congress of the United States to tell the executive branch of the Government where the administration of legislation passed by Congress shall be vested.

I want Mr. Harding to understand that that happens to be a legislative prerogative and duty on the part of Congress, and does not fall within the purview of the jurisdiction of the Office of Economic Opportunity or any other department or agency of the executive branch downtown.

Mr. President, I have been speaking about the constitutional power and prerogative of the President of the United States to nominate people for office as a constitutional right of the President under the advice-and-consent clause. Of course, the power and right of the President to nominate people for office requiring Senate confirmation is a vital part of the separation-of-powers doctrine, as it relates to the Presidency of the United States.

I remind my President from the floor of the Senate tonight that the President of the United States also has the power to fire officials in the executive branch of the Government; and I wish to say further that I think the President ought to give some consideration to the possible results of this kind of a legislative declaration of war on the part of Mr. Harding, the President's Acting Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. I want the President to know and I would suggest that Mr. Harding take thought that this kind of letter will only serve to embarrass the executive branch of the Government, including the President of the United States; and as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Education, I am perfect willing to accept his legislative declaration of war, and as far as I am concerned, the sooner Mr. Harding is retired to the hinterlands of America from which he came, the better it will be for the cause of good government in the United States.

Mr. President, I think this is an inexcusable letter to be circulated by even the acting head of any branch of the executive department of this Govern-

ment, and I trust that the advisers of the President and the President himself will take note of this presumptuousness of the Acting Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

STRANGE SETTLEMENT OF DAMAGE CLAIMS BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, we oftentimes hear of the adults' lack of comprehension of modern math, but I doubt that even the modern mathematicians can keep pace with the computations of the Great Society.

Today I call attention to a situation wherein under the settlement of a fraud claim against a Belgium contractor the Government boasts of having collected \$443,000 in indemnities when in reality it not only collected nothing but actually paid an additional \$390,000 to this contractor, thus disposing of the civil fraud charges.

Under date of February 7, 1968, as appearing in the temporary CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page S1014, I called attention to a \$2 million contract negotiated with J. & M. Adriaenssens, N. V. Hoboken, Belgium, wherein under our AID program the Government had been defrauded. This contract was for the repair and reconditioning of Government excess property in order that it could be used under our AID program. This contract had been modified several times with the approval of high officials of AID, and the Department's files contained serious charges that four employees of AID had been accepting from the contractor goods of value in the form of cash or services, and so forth, in return for their approval of liberalizations of the contract. The four employees were allowed to resign, and later we were told that charges were being placed against them. At the moment I have no report as to the disposition of their cases.

I was advised that this case of alleged fraud had been turned over to the Department of Justice for prosecution and that claims for damages were being filed against the company.

I now outline the strange manner in which this case has been settled by the Department of Justice on what they describe as favorable terms for the American taxpayers.

The Government had brought charges of fraud and filed claims against the contractor for \$443,000, but they said the contractor responded by filing counterclaims against the Government for \$833,000. Then in a spirit of compromise the Government agreed to pay the company \$390,000 and each side would drop all claims. The agency now pats itself on the back for having done so well for the American taxpayers.

I quote from the Government's report:

A.I.D. has now entered into a settlement agreement with the J & M Adriaenssens firm in Antwerp, Belgium, settling A.I.D.'s claims against that firm for inadequate performance under the contract to rehabilitate excess property for A.I.D.

Under the settlement, A.I.D. in effect recovers \$442,000. This is the agreed amount of reduction from Adriaenssens' outstanding bills and other claims for payment under the contract. These outstanding billings and

Sept 9, 1968

11. ADJOURNED until Wed., Sept. 11. p. S10499

HOUSE

12. PEARS. Rejected, 111-165, H. R. 10564, to provide marketing orders for pears for canning or freezing. pp. H8351-61

13. APPROPRIATIONS. Conferees were appointed on H. R. 17023, the Independent Offices and HUD appropriation bill, 1969. Senate conferees have been appointed. p. H8351

14. FOREIGN AID. The conferees agreed to file a report on H. R. 15263, the foreign aid bill (p. D806). Inserted in the "Daily Digest" is a table comparing House and Senate passed amounts and amounts agreed upon by the conferees (p. D807).

15. SCENIC RIVERS. The Rules Committee granted an open rule for consideration of H.R. 18260, to provide for a national scenic rivers system. p. D806

16. RECREATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 8970, to establish the North Cascades National Park and Ross Lake National Recreation Area, to designate the Pasayten Wilderness and to modify the Glacier Peak Wilderness, Wash. (H. Rept. 1870). p. H8425

17. LANDS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 17874, to extend the time for filing of applications for the selection of certain lands by Alaska. p. D806

18. REDWOOD PARK. The conferees agreed to file a report on S. 2515, to authorize the establishment of the Redwood National Park. p. D807

19. TRAILS. The conferees agreed to file a report on S. 827, to establish a nationwide system of trails. p. D807

20. BUDGET. Rep. Mahon summarized and inserted a release by Budget Bureau Director Zwick, "Summer Review of the 1969 Budget." pp. H8350, E7754-8

21. DAIRY IMPORTS. Rep. Langen stated the "six-month dairy import totals just released by the USDA confirm the need for the present Tariff Commission hearings to come forth with added restrictions." p. H8350

22. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Findley spoke in support of a payment limitation in any extension of the farm program and inserted a list of payments of \$20,000 or more under the 1967 farm programs. pp. H8362-407

Rep. Zwach expressed concern over "low" rural income and inserted a letter he sent the President asking relief for this situation. p. H8362-3

23. TRANSPORTATION. Rep. Schwengel inserted a paper prepared for the Highway Safety Committee of the National Research Council, "Some Safety Aspects of the Size and Weight of Vehicles." pp. H8407-10

24. POTOMAC RIVER. Rep. Mathias, Md., spoke in support of legislation to protect and develop the Potomac River Valley. pp. H8411-12

25. NATURAL RESOURCES. Rep. Aspinall inserted an address, "Responsibilities in Utilizing Natural Resources to the Greatest Advantage." pp. H8412-14

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

26. LANDS. Rep. Aspinall inserted an article focusing attention on some of the problems that surround the administration of our public lands. p. E7741
27. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Madden stated that "few Members of Congress realize the terrific financial drain the Agricultural Act of 1965 has inflicted on the American taxpayers and also its relations with the Commodity Credit Corporation." pp. E7759
28. INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS. Rep. Brademas inserted his address before the American Political Science Ass'n., "Government, the Foundations, and the University." pp. E7764-6
29. FOREIGN AID; REPORT. Rep. Cunningham reported to his constituents on the "growing and unbelievable waste in the foreign aid program." pp. E7773-4
30. CONSUMER CREDIT. Rep. Sullivan stated that enactment of consumer credit legislation will result in a vast improvement in the quantity and relevance of the information given to consumers in the utilization of credit, and inserted her speech, "Hardheaded But Not Hardhearted Credit Policies." pp. E7774-6

BILLS INTRODUCED

31. FOREIGN TRADE. H. R. 19608 by Rep. Monagan, to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; to the Ways and Means Committee.
32. RURAL AREAS. H. R. 19610 by Rep. Robison, to establish a community self-determination program to aid the people of urban and rural communities in securing gainful employment, achieving the ownership and control of the resources of their communities, expanding opportunity, stability, and self-determination, and making their maximum contribution to the strength and well-being of the Nation; to the Ways and Means Committee.
33. TAXES. H. R. 19613 by Rep. Zwach, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the requirements relating to declarations of estimated tax in the case of taxpayers who are farmers (or fishermen), by providing that the filing of an income tax return (on or before April 15) by any such taxpayer shall satisfy such requirements; to Ways and Means Committee.

O

COMMITTEE HEARINGS SEPT. 10:

General farm legislation, H. Agriculture (exec).

Flat fee for certain import inspections, H. Ways and Means (exec) (Mulhern, ARS, to testify).

Nationwide system of trails, conferees (exec).

oOo

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 310]

Adair	Fraser	Poage
Ashley	Friedel	Podell
Ashmore	Fulton, Tenn.	Pucinski
Baring	Galifianakis	Quile
Barrett	Gardner	Quillen
Blackburn	Goodell	Rarick
Blanton	Green, Oreg.	Reifel
Blatnik	Griffiths	Resnick
Boland	Grover	Reuss
Bolling	Gude	Rhodes, Pa.
Bolton	Gurney	Rivers
Brasco	Hansen, Wash.	Rogers, Colo.
Brock	Hardy	Rogers, Fla.
Brotzman	Hébert	Ronan
Brown, Calif.	Heckler, Mass.	Roudebush
Brown, Mich.	Henderson	Roybal
Brown, Ohio	Herlong	Ruppe
Button	Hoiifield	Satterfield
Carey	Jacobs	St. Germain
Casey	Jonas	Saylor
Celmer	Jones, Mo.	Schadeberg
Ciancy	Jones, N.C.	Scherle
Cleveland	Karsten	Schweiker
Collier	Keith	Seiden
Collins	Kuykendall	Sisk
Conyers	Kyros	Smith, Iowa
Corbett	Landrum	Smith, Okla.
Corman	Lloyd	Stafford
Culver	Long, La.	Steed
Cunningham	McClory	Stelger, Wis.
Curtis	McDade	Stephens
Dent	McMillan	Taft
Derwinski	Macdonald	Teague, Calif.
Diggs	Machen	Teague, Tex.
Doie	Mathias, Md.	Thompson, Ga.
Donohue	Minshall	Thompson, N.J.
Dorn	Monagan	Tuck
Eckhardt	Moorhead	Udall
Edwards, La.	Myers	Watkins
Ellberg	Nix	Whalley
Evans, Colo.	O'Hara, Ill.	Willis
Faion	O'Hara, Mich.	Wolff
Farbstein	O'Neal, Ga.	Wydler
Fino	Patman	Wyman
Flynt	Pike	
Fountain	Pirnie	

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1224

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10564) to amend section 2(3), section 8c(2), and section 8c(6)(I) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTI] and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. YOUNG asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1224 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 10564 to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended.

At present there are five commodities for canning or freezing that are eligible for marketing order programs. In addition, apples for canning or freezing in certain States are also eligible for this program. The commodities are asparagus, olives, grapefruit, cherries, and cranberries. Certainly producers of pears for canning or freezing should also be given the opportunity to establish a marketing order program.

The purpose of H.R. 10564 is to add pears for canning or freezing to the list of commodities for which Federal marketing orders may be made applicable, and it would permit the inclusion of a checkoff for marketing promotion projects, including paid advertising, for this commodity.

The annual cost for administering each new marketing order program is approximately \$25,000.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1224 in order that H.R. 10564 may be considered.

(Mr. QUILLEN (at the request of Mr. LATTI) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1224 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for the consideration of H.R. 10564 which would bring pears for canning and freezing under the marketing control provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937.

No doubt few Federal statutes are as complex and as devoid of clarity as is the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 and its various amendments. Nevertheless, few statutes have a more

direct impact on the prices we, as consumers, pay for the agricultural products which form the essential parts of our daily diet.

Ever since its first adopted the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act, Congress has acknowledged the wisdom and desirability of maintaining the general marketing order exemption for canning and freezing crops. Congress has recognized that it is one thing to authorize growers to control their own production and shipment of raw products for the fresh market—where they have a substantial financial risk and investment in the product as purchased by the consumer.

But it is quite a different thing to tell growers they can get together and control the production of the canned product—when the canner has the principal investment in the commodity as purchased by the consumer and has taken over entirely the grower's financial risk and marketing responsibilities.

So that the House may have a clear idea of why I am opposed to the authorization of marketing orders for canning crops, it may be helpful for me to review briefly how a marketing order could be adopted for pears for processing, and what it could provide if this bill is enacted.

The Secretary of Agriculture initiates the proceeding by publishing a proposed marketing order, developed either within the Department or by some other party, such as a grower's organization. All interested persons are given an opportunity to appear at the hearing, present evidence, and file arguments or briefs.

If the Secretary decides that the issuance of an order will tend to effectuate the declared policy of the act, the order is published. But it does not become effective until the Secretary determines that it is approved or favored by at least two-thirds of the producers—that is, the growers—of the commodity, or by producers who produce at least two-thirds of the volume of the commodity.

Thus, although processors and other handlers of pears could appear at the hearings and file comments, they would have no vote as to whether the order issued by the Secretary of Agriculture would become effective. And the policy sections of the act make it clear that it is only the interest of producers, not processors, that must be considered in formulating the provisions of an order.

Once approved and adopted, the order would be administered by a committee of growers, because the act contains no requirement that any handlers be represented on such committees. The development of marketing policy under the order is in the hands of this grower committee, and the final decision lies with the Secretary.

The expenses of operating the marketing order would be borne not by the producers for whose benefit it was adopted, but by the handlers—in this instance, the canners who purchased pears for processing. The amount of the assessment would be set by the committee and the Secretary, but producers would pay no

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 293 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 17023, DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 17023) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. EVINS of Tennessee, BOLAND, SHIPLEY, GIAIMO, MARSH, PRYOR, MAHON, JONAS, MINSHALL, WYMAN, TALCOTT, and BOW.

MARKETING ORDERS ON PEARS FOR CANNING OR FREEZING

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1224 and ask for its immediate consideration.

part of the costs of operations under the order.

A Federal marketing order cannot impose any controls on producers. Only the canners and other handlers would be regulated. And penalties for noncompliance would, of course, apply only to canners, not to growers, who are completely free, if they wish, to try to evade any restriction or requirement imposed by the order.

On the raw product side, the order could regulate what, when, and how much a canner could purchase for processing. He could be told what grades he could buy, and in what amounts from which growers. No greater degree of outside control over a canner's procurement of the raw product could be imagined.

The order tells the canner what he can buy. It does not tell the grower what he can sell. Perhaps if the House realizes that fact it will understand exactly why the canning industry is opposed to this legislation and why they believe it is unfair for the canning industry not to have a say in what is adopted and authorized.

Surplus elimination could be imposed, and reserve pools could be established, to be held in processed form and disposed of at a later date, under the direction of the committee.

Now to present some arguments against H.R. 10564, the pear marketing control bill.

The canning and freezing industry is also opposed to the bill because it would permit pear growers, through a Federal program administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, to control the conditions under which processors could obtain pears for canning and freezing.

This proposal is undemocratic in that it would deny canners and freezers the right to vote on a marketing order program, and it does not assure them representation in the administration of an order. While some say that a marketing order program involves only the interests of the producers, the truth is that any control program would be designed to indirectly control the marketing of the canned product. Thus, the canner, with a total investment greater than that of the grower and including the raw product, the processing labor, the can and the shipping case, and the marketing expense of the canned item would be subject to a USDA administered control and marketing program.

What are the results of such a marketing control program? Here is what they are:

First. The consumer will pay more.

Second. Growers will get relatively less.

Third. The inefficient will be kept in a marginal status.

Fourth. The United States will move another step closer to a total agricultural cartel run by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. LATTA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the statement just made by my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Young], concerning the rule

granted by our Committee on Rules for the consideration of this legislation, H.R. 10564. However, I hasten to point out the fact that this Democrat-controlled Congress should not attempt to mislead anyone into believing that this Congress is about to do anything of substance for our Nation's farmers in passing a bill to provide marketing orders for a handful of pear producers on the west coast.

Rather than considering this bill today, Mr. Speaker, I believe the House should be considering legislation to increase farm income immediately. I say this as I believe we have a real farm crisis in America, and this administration and this Democrat-controlled Congress either cannot recognize it or they do not want to recognize it.

As I informed this House on July 31, 1968, our Nation's farmers are receiving only 73 percent of parity for their products—the lowest in 30 years—and all my Democrat friends want to do about it is to extend their same price-depressing programs for 4 more years. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand how my Democrat friends can in good conscience ask the farmers of the Nation to continue them in the majority in this Congress when all they have to offer them is "more of the same."

I think it would be worthwhile to take time here and now to see what has been happening to our farmers under this Democrat administration and under Democrat-controlled Congresses:

First. Realized farm income declined by \$1.9 billion from 1966 to 1967. In 1967 alone, farmers suffered an 11.5-percent drop in realized net income. Our farmers suffered this drop in income at the same time every other segment of the economy was experiencing an increase in income.

Second. A 31-percent increase in the farmers' cost of production occurred during the past 7 years.

Third. A drop of over 6 points occurred in the farm parity ratio over the past 7 years.

Fourth. Farm debt increased by 90 percent in the last 7 years. Total farm debt in the United States is now \$49.9 billion, a figure greater than the entire Federal budget in 1951.

Fifth. Rural poverty as identified by the President's Commission now encompasses 14,000,000 Americans, which proves that the administration is long on talk and short on action in improving farm income.

Sixth. The Nation has suffered a loss of more than 900,000 farms since 1960, and this rate of loss continues at more than 100,000 farms per year.

Seventh. Farm prices are now so low, Mr. Speaker, that it takes two bushels of corn or two bushels of wheat to purchase a \$2 haircut. A farmer must sell four bushels of oats to pay for this same haircut. In 1967, only 17.7 percent of our citizens' disposable income went for food, down from 18.1 percent in 1966. In comparison, a consumer in the United Kingdom spends about 26 percent of his income for food; in France, 29 percent; in Austria, 32 percent; and in Italy, 42 percent. Is further evidence needed to prove that our farmers are not getting their

fair share of our gross national product under this administration?

Mr. Speaker, I think it is well to note here some of the administration actions which have contributed to the plight of our farmers:

First. Historically, Government price support programs have fixed the market price of the commodities and continue to do so. The administration has steadfastly refused to increase the support price of price-supported commodities. On July 31, 1968, had I had Democratic support for my amendment to fix the level of price support to be made available to wheat and feed grain cooperators at 100 percent of parity, my amendment would have passed with Senate and White House approval, farm income would have been increased almost immediately. Under my amendment, farmers would have received \$2.61 for wheat; \$1.62 for corn; and 89 cents a bushel for oats.

Second. The administration has dumped huge stocks of commodity credit grains upon the domestic market in order to depress grain and livestock market prices and to force noncooperators into Government program. The Secretary of Agriculture dumped surplus corn on the market to depress the price on one occasion and was so successful that he later announced he was "pleased" when corn prices fell. The New York Times reported this was the first time in the memory of Federal officials that a Secretary of Agriculture had declared he was pleased at a decline in income for farmers.

Third. The administration has delayed necessary action to reduce price-depressing dairy imports.

Fourth. The administration cut back purchases of pork and dairy products by the Department of Defense.

Fifth. Underestimated cattle by 4 million head and turkey population by 5 million birds, thereby bringing an already weak market down further.

Sixth. Restricted exports of cattle hides.

Seventh. Failed to take effective action against beef imports.

Eighth. Boosted imports of raw sugar.

Ninth. Federal Government purchased foreign food products for our Armed Forces at the same time these commodities were in surplus in the United States.

Tenth. The administration attempted to inflict drastic cuts in certain agricultural research and other programs that serve our Nation.

Eleventh. The President urged housewives to reduce buying of certain food items in an effort to depress prices.

Twelfth. Failed to exact any meaningful agreements that could have helped the American agricultural economy at the Geneva tariff negotiations.

With this record, Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that the American farmer is disenchanted with this administration and this Democrat-controlled Congress? I am convinced that unless farm prices are substantially increased between now and November 5, our farmers will be voting for a Republican administration and a Republican-controlled Congress. Our Nation's farmers cannot continue to receive such a small share of our Nation's income and will be voting for a change on November 5.

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued September 19, 1968
For actions of September 18, 1968
90th-2nd No. 152

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....11	Imports.....12	Property.....9
Budget.....5	Interest rates.....26	Recreation.....28
CCC.....11,34	Lands.....32	Research station.....9
Commerce Department.....14	Leave.....8	Retirement.....8,33
Education.....10	Legislative program.....29	Rural development.....36
Employment.....36	Manpower.....35	School lunch.....21
Expenditures.....5,34	Nomination.....23	Scenic rivers.....4
Farm credit.....7,19	Noxious plants.....20	Stockpiling.....17
Farm program.....1,30	Peanuts.....30	Supergrades.....3
Foreign relations.....24	Personnel.....3,8,33	Taxation.....6
Foreign trade.....12	Personnel ceilings.....34	Trails.....2
Highways.....16,27	Pesticides.....18,25	Transportation.....13
Hunger.....31	Pollution.....15	Wilderness.....22

HIGHLIGHTS. House received conference report recommending 1 year extension of farm program. Senate ordered school lunch bill to lie on table. House agreed to conference report on trails bill. House rejected resolution to clear supergrades bill. Conferees agreed to file report on scenic rivers bill. Senate concurred in House amendment to N. J. wilderness bill. Senate committee reported Davis nomination to be Assistant Secretary of USDA. Rep. Tunney introduced and discussed bills to provide rural-urban balance.

HOUSE

- 1. FARM PROGRAM.** Received the conference report on H. R. 17126, the farm bill (H. Rept. 1905). The conference substitute extends the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 for 1 year and omits all other amendments. p. H8952
- 2. TRAILS.** Agreed to the conference report on S. 827, to establish a nationwide system of trails (pp. H8884-6). See Digest 148 for provisions of conference report.

3. SUPERGRADES. Rejected, 134-221, a resolution for the consideration of H. R. 15890, to provide for additional supergrade positions in certain executive agencies. pp. H8889-94
4. SCENIC RIVERS. Conferees agreed to file a report on S. 119, to reserve certain public lands for a national wild rivers system. p. D845
5. BUDGET. Rep. Curtis claimed that the cutback of \$6 billion required in the tax increase and expenditure control bill "has been reversed" and that the net total budgeted outlays are now estimated to be \$191 billion for fiscal year 1969 p. H8882
6. TAXATION. The Ways and Means Committee reported with amendment H. R. 17332, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 regarding taxes on gasoline and oil used for agricultural purposes (H. Rept. 1901); and with amendments H. R. 14095, to make certain changes to facilitate the production of wine (H. Rept. 1899). p. H8961
7. FARM CREDIT. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 19418, to expedite retirement of Government capital from Federal intermediate credit banks, production credit associations, and banks for cooperatives (H. Rept. 1897 p. H8961
8. PERSONNEL. Agreed to a resolution for the consideration of H. R. 17682, civil service retirement financing (pp. H8898-900). This bill includes provisions that the period for determining average salary for annuity computation purposes would be changed from 5 years to 3 years, that unused sick leave would be added to the actual length of service for computing the annuity of an employee retiring or the annuity of the survivors of an employee dying in service, and that an extra 1 percent would be added to each annuity increase resulting from changes in the Consumer Price Index.
Concurred in Senate amendments with an amendment, to H. R. 13844, to provide additional leave of absence for Federal employees in connection with the funerals of their immediate relatives who died while on duty in the Armed Force p. H8888
9. RESEARCH STATION. A subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee approved for full committee action H. R. 14388, to convey certain real property in the Agricultural Research Center, Beltsville, Md. p. D844
10. EDUCATION. The conferees agreed to file a report on S. 3769, the proposed Higher Education Amendments of 1968. p. D845
11. APPROPRIATIONS. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 18785, the military construction appropriation bill, and agreed on the amendment in disagreement (pp. H8883-4, S10944-5). This bill includes funds for payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation on the indebtedness for housing constructed in foreign countries with foreign currencies derived from the sale of surplus commodities. The bill will now be sent to the President.
Received the conference report on H. R. 17023, the independent offices and HUD appropriation bill, 1969 (H. Rept. 1904). p. H8961

INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE BUREAUS, BOARDS, COMMISSIONS,
CORPORATIONS, AGENCIES, OFFICES, AND THE DEPARTMENT
OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS

SEPTEMBER 18, 1968.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, from the committee of conference, submitted
the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 17023]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17023) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, 29, 31, 33, 35, 42, and 43.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 9, 10, 17, 18, 21, 23, 26, 30, 36, 37, 39, and 40, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,800,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$173,600,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$10,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$37,200,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *\$15,100,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *\$275,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *\$12,500,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *\$750,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *\$43,838,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *\$312,500,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *\$625,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *\$11,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$30,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$93,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 15 and 41.

JOE L. EVINS,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
GEORGE E. SHIPLEY,
ROBERT N. GIAIMO,
JOHN O. MARSH, Jr.,
DAVID PRYOR,
GEORGE MAHON,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,
LOUIS C. WYMAN,
BURT L. TALCOTT,
FRANK T. BOW,

Managers on the Part of the House.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
GORDON ALLOTT,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
NORRIS COTTON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 17023) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$1,800,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$1,750,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,850,000 as proposed by the Senate.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$173,600,000 for Appalachian regional development programs instead of \$168,600,000 as proposed by the House and \$178,600,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference committee feels that the \$5,000,000 increase over the House amount should be used for health programs.

DISASTER RELIEF

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates \$10,000,000 for disaster relief instead of \$5,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$15,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates \$37,200,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$37,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$37,564,000 as proposed by the Senate.

COMMISSION ON EXECUTIVE, LEGISLATIVE, AND JUDICIAL SALARIES

Amendment No. 5: Inserts Senate proposal to appropriate \$100,000 for salaries and expenses of the Commission.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates \$19,750,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of \$20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates \$15,100,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$15,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$15,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates \$275,000,000 for operating expenses, Public Buildings Service, instead of \$271,881,000 as proposed by the House and \$276,763,000 as proposed by the Senate.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Amendment No. 9: Inserts language earmarking \$150,000 for pipeline valuation work as proposed by the Senate. The committee of conference notes that the Commission currently makes no charge for pipeline valuations, although the industry uses the valuations as the basis for determining allowable earnings. Under a Supreme Court consent decree, earnings may not exceed 7 percent on their valuation. The Commission is urged to review its fee structure to cover the cost of such valuation work.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates \$3,370,300,000 for research and development as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,383,250,000 as proposed by the House. The committee of conference notes that the Administrator has flexibility within this appropriation to use such funds as may be required and deemed necessary to continue the nuclear rocket engine (NERVA) development program.

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates \$21,800,000 for construction of facilities as proposed by the House instead of \$34,750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Amendments Nos. 12 and 13: Authorizes the maintenance and operation of three aircraft as proposed by the House instead of the purchase of one aircraft and the maintenance and operation of four as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates \$400,000,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of \$410,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15: Reported in technical disagreement. The House conferees will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment.

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates \$3,000,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of \$3,080,000 as proposed by the Senate.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates \$17,830,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$17,730,000 as proposed by the House.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates \$46,850,000 for medical and prosthetic research as proposed by the Senate instead of \$45,850,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates \$195,000,000 for general operating expenses as proposed by the House instead of \$197,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

CIVIL DEFENSE

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates \$48,040,000 for operation and maintenance as proposed by the House instead of \$48,640,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21: Authorizes \$19,100,000 for matching grants for personnel and administrative expenses of State and local civil defense organizations as proposed by the Senate instead of \$18,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates \$12,500,000 for research, shelter survey, and marking instead of \$10,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$15,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II

Amendment No. 23: Inserts heading as proposed by the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Amendment No. 24: Inserts language for urban renewal programs as proposed by the Senate and appropriates \$750,000,000 for such programs instead of \$1,250,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates \$43,838,000 for urban planning grants instead of \$38,838,000 as proposed by the House and \$47,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates \$165,000,000 for grants for basic water and sewer facilities as proposed by the Senate instead of \$150,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 27 and 28: Appropriate \$625,000,000 for model cities programs including \$312,500,000 for urban renewal projects within model cities programs, instead of \$500,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,000,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, and earmarking \$100,000,000 for urban renewal as proposed by the House and \$500,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29: Deletes proposal of the Senate to appropriate \$2,500,000 for urban information and technical assistance.

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates \$1,400,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,860,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 31: Restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate pertaining to the administration and implementation of section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966.

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates \$11,000,000 for urban research and technology instead of \$10,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$15,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 33: Restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate limiting administrative expenses for urban research and technology to \$500,000.

Amendment No. 34: Provides \$30,000,000 annual contract authorization for the rent supplement program instead of \$25,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$65,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The committee of conference agrees that the Congress intended market rate mortgages in the rent supplement program to be financed in the private market in the usual conventional way, and expects the Secretary to be guided accordingly. In those cases where this is not possible, in every rent supplement project the sponsor shall be required to provide at least a 10-percent equity investment, except for nonprofit organizations where 5 percent is required if assistance is sought under the special assistance program of FNMA.

Amendment No. 35: Deletes proposal of the Senate to appropriate \$9,000,000 for the fair housing program. The budget request for this item was submitted to the Senate on the passage of a new law after the House had acted on this bill. The Department of Housing and Urban Development, as well as a number of other Federal agencies, are already engaged in the activities provided for in the Senate proposal with substantial personnel engaged in such activities. If facts can be presented in the future to prove the necessity for additional funds the committee will consider such a request.

TITLE III—CORPORATIONS

Amendment No. 36: Changes the center heading to title III instead of title II as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37: Authorizes \$11,675,000 for administrative expenses of the Federal Housing Administration as proposed by the Senate instead of \$11,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 38: Authorizes \$93,000,000 for nonadministrative expenses of the Federal Housing Administration instead of \$92,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$94,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 39 and 40: Change title numbers as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 41: Reported in technical disagreement. The House conferees will offer a motion to authorize \$357,000 for the President's Council on Youth Opportunity as proposed by the Senate, \$485,000 for the Interagency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs instead of \$575,000 as proposed by the Senate, \$300,000 for

the United States-Mexico Commission for Border Development and Friendship instead of \$455,000 as proposed by the Senate, and \$100,000 for the National Council on Indian Opportunity instead of \$375,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 42 and 43: Restore the language of section 308 of the bill to the original House language instead of inserting and deleting certain language as proposed by the Senate.

JOE L. EVINS,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
GEORGE E. SHIPLEY,
ROBERT N. GIAIMO,
JOHN O. MARSH, Jr.,
DAVID PRYOR,
GEORGE MAHON,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,
LOUIS C. WYMAN,
BURT L. TALCOTT,
FRANK T. BOW,
Managers on the Part of the House.

○

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued September 20, 1968
For actions of September 19, 1968
90th-2nd; No. 153

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....11	Foreign trade.....8,24,28	Non-farm income.....31
Annuities.....6	Forest policies.....22	Opinion polls.....30
Appropriations..2,14,21,29	Freight rates.....27	Personnel.....6
Border inspection.....7	Highways.....35	Redwood National Park...17
Consumers.....26	Inflation.....9	Reports.....30
Dairy.....28,32	Information.....33	Retirement.....6,10,36
Expenditures.....35	Intergovernmental	Taxation.....18,31
Farm labor.....23	relations.....4	Trails.....15
Farm program.....10,12	Lands.....20	Water resources.....16
Firefighters.....6	Legislative program..10,21	Weights and measures....25
Food services.....5	Log exports.....24	Wilderness.....13
Food stamps.....3,10	Meat imports.....8	Youth Corps.....34
Foreign aid.....1	Nomination.....19	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate agreed to conference report recommending 1 year extension of farm program. House received conference report on food stamp bill. Both Houses agreed to conference report on foreign-aid authorization bill. House passed foreign-aid appropriation bill. Senate concurred in House amendment to Wash. wilderness bill. Senate agreed to conference report on trails bill and Redwood Park bill.

HOUSE

1. FOREIGN AID. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 15263, the foreign-aid authorization bill. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 811108-112, H8965-9
2. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed, 173-139, as reported H. R. 19908, the foreign-aid appropriation bill, which had been reported earlier in the day by the Appropriations Committee (H. Rept. 1906). pp. H8963, H8965, H8976-98

Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 17023, the independent offices and HEW appropriation bill. pp. H8969-75

3. FOOD STAMPS. Received the conference report on S. 3608, to continue authorizations for the Food Stamp Act of 1964 (H. Rept. 1908). The revised bill extends the authorization through Dec. 1970. It authorizes \$315 million for 1969, \$340 million for 1970, and \$170 million for the first half of 1971. It omits the provision making strikers and students ineligible under certain conditions. It includes the House requirement for annual reports from the Department. pp. H8998-9
4. INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS. Conferees were appointed on S. 698, the proposed Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968. Senate conferees have been appointed. p. H9000
5. FOOD SERVICES. The D. C. Committee reported with amendments S. 2012, to amend the D. C. Public School Food Services Act (H. Rept. 1915). p. H9008
6. PERSONNEL. A subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee approved for full committee action S. 1190, relating to computation of surviving spouses' annuities of reemployed annuitants, and postponed action on S. 1507, to include firefighters within hazardous-occupation retirement provisions. p. D851
7. BORDER INSPECTION. Rep. Bob Wilson said inspection personnel on the Mexican border should be increased. pp. H8964-5
8. MEAT IMPORTS. Rep. Kleppe said a recent voluntary reduction in meat exports by Australia and New Zealand "may temporarily take some of the pressure off the domestic cattle market" but that a meat-import control law is still needed. p. H9001
9. INFLATION. Rep. Dorn deplored the Chrysler price increase as inflationary. p. H9003
10. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Albert announced that the conference reports on the farm and food stamp bills will be considered beginning next Wed. and that the retirement financing bill will be considered Tues. or later in the week. p. H9000
11. ADJOURNED until Mon., Sept. 23. p. H9007

SENATE

12. FARM PROGRAM. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 17126, the farm bill. The conference substitute extends the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 for 1 year and omits all other provisions of the House bill and of the Senate amendment. p. S11107
Sen. McGee inserted a paper by a small Wyo. farmer, "Farm Programs in Perspective." pp. S11083-4
13. WILDERNESS. Concurred in the House amendment to S. 1321, to establish the North Cascades National Park and Ross Lake National Recreation Area, to designate the Pasayten Wilderness and to modify the Glacier Peak Wilderness, Wash. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. S11039

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1968.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 17023,
INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DE-
PARTMENT OF HOUSING AND
URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 17023) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of September 18, 1968.)

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we bring back a conference report on the Department of Housing and Urban Development and several independent offices and agencies.

This bill passed the House on May 5 on the regular schedule. It was not considered in the Senate until just before the recess, and then it was sent to a conference.

All legislation, as we know, is a matter of compromise. Substantial reductions were made in the bill, and we have brought back what we feel is a good conference report, signed by all members of the conference on the part of the House and the Senate.

Initially, the Senate agreed with some 40 items, and stated throughout the report they concurred in the House findings. We concurred in several items.

There were about 30 items on which

we were in disagreement. Of these 30 items in disagreement, Mr. Speaker, the Senate yielded on 14 items and the House yielded on about 13 items. We have made some substantial reductions.

In an overall way I would say the bill for the 21 Independent Agencies and the Department of Housing and Urban Development carried a budget request of \$18,353,717,300. The bill after the conference calls for \$14,570,395,000. This is a cut, reduction under the budget of \$3,783,322,300, or a cut of three and three-quarters billion.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to reemphasize this. The conference report which we bring before the House today makes a reduction from the President's budget of more than three and three-quarters billion dollars.

This is one of the largest of the several annual appropriation bills, this is one of the largest reductions and this reduction compares favorably with that made in the Defense Department appropriation which was considered recently.

All member of the conference are familiar with the conference report, and we are here to answer any questions that may arise in the minds of any of the Members.

By way of breakdown and to supply my colleagues with additional details, the Senate bill called for \$1,250,000,000 for the regular urban renewal program throughout the United States.

The House did not consider this item in its bill because the new housing bill which included the urban renewal authorization was passed after the independent offices and HUD appropriations bill passed the House last April.

The conference report recommends \$750 million for the regular urban renewal program—a \$500 million cut and reduction under the Senate bill.

For the model cities program the House originally approved \$500 million—a half billion dollars. The Senate approved \$1 billion. The conference report calls for \$625 million which represents a \$375 million cut and reduction under the Senate bill.

For the rent supplement program the budget request was for \$65 million in new contract authority. The House originally approved \$25 million and the Senate approved the full request of \$65 million. The conference report calls for \$30 million in new contract authority.

In terms of the 40-year commitment which each appropriation for rent sup-

plement carries, the conference report involves contract authority totaling \$1.2 billion. This represents a cut and reduction of \$1.4 billion from the \$2.6 billion contract authority over the 40-year period in the Senate bill.

Concerning the model cities, Mr. Speaker, Congress made its commitment and we must move ahead with the program in line with our commitment. We must keep faith with our mayors who are in the front lines in the battle to solve the problems of our cities.

It is our information that planning is well underway in 75 cities announced in the initial round of model cities—and 33 more cities recently have been added.

I want to emphasize that private enterprise supports the program. Support has come from such national leaders as Mr. Fred Borch, president of General Electric Corp.; D. C. Burnham, president of Westinghouse Corp., and David Rockefeller, president of Chase Manhattan Bank, among others.

It is important to stress also that the model cities program represents a total approach to solution of the problems of our cities—a coordinated approach utilizing all the resources of the Federal, State, and local governments together with private enterprise to solve the problems of a model city area. This contrasts with the piecemeal approach which has been the pattern in the past.

Concerning the rent supplement program, this is an ongoing successful program. This program is being utilized.

Today there are 625 projects in 372 cities in 48 States.

These projects contain a total of almost 62,679 units of housing and 3,017 families are occupying rent supplement units.

As has been often emphasized, the rent supplement program is a private enterprise approach to providing needed low-rent housing, and offers an alternative to Government-financed, Government-operated, Government-regulated public housing.

The need is urgent: An estimated 6,000,000 families live in substandard housing and 500,000 are on the waiting list for public housing.

This is a program for the poor and requirements are even stricter than those for admission to public housing.

A comparative statement of conference action follows:

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND HUD APPROPRIATION BILL, 1969 (H.R. 17023)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF CONFERENCE ACTION

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1968 ¹	Budget esti- mates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill, fiscal year 1969	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill, fiscal year 1969	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
TITLE I								
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT								
NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL								
Salaries and expenses.....	\$524,000	\$524,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	—\$24,000		
OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING								
Salaries and expenses.....	4,700,000	5,043,000	4,850,000	4,850,000	4,850,000	—193,000		
Salaries and expenses, telecommunications.....	1,945,000	1,986,000	1,675,000	1,675,000	1,675,000	—311,000		
Civil defense and defense mobilization func- tions of Federal agencies.....	3,102,000	3,135,000	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000	—35,000		
Total, Office of Emergency Planning.....	9,747,000	10,164,000	9,625,000	9,625,000	9,625,000	—539,000		
OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY								
Salaries and expenses.....	1,550,000	1,985,000	1,750,000	1,850,000	1,800,000	—185,000	+\$50,000	—\$50,000
Energy study.....		500,000				—500,000		
Total, Office of Science and Tech- nology.....	1,550,000	2,485,000	1,750,000	1,850,000	1,800,000	—685,000	+50,000	—50,000
PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON POSTAL ORGANIZATION								
Salaries and expenses.....	1,000,000							
Total, Executive Office of the President.....	12,821,000	13,173,000	11,875,000	11,975,000	11,925,000	—1,248,000	+50,000	—50,000
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT								
Appalachian regional development programs.....	126,700,000	213,600,000	168,600,000	178,000,000	173,600,000	—40,000,000	+5,000,000	—5,000,000
Disaster relief.....	20,000,000	15,000,000	5,000,000	15,000,000	10,000,000	—5,000,000	+5,000,000	—5,000,000
Total, funds appropriated to the Presi- dent.....	146,700,000	228,600,000	173,600,000	193,600,000	183,600,000	—45,000,000	+10,000,000	—10,000,000
INDEPENDENT OFFICES								
APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses.....	² 745,750	879,000	850,000	850,000	850,000	—29,000		
CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD								
Salary and expenses.....	9,082,000	9,700,000	9,350,000	9,350,000	9,350,000	—350,000		
Payments to air carriers (appropriation to liqui- date contract authorization).....	³ (52,500,000)	(47,600,000)	(45,000,000)	(45,000,000)	(45,000,000)	(—2,600,000)		
Total, Civil Aeronautics Board.....	9,082,000	9,700,000	9,350,000	9,350,000	9,350,000	—350,000		
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses:								
Appropriation.....	36,910,000	39,309,000	37,000,000	37,564,000	37,200,000	—2,109,000	+200,000	—364,000
By transfer.....	(6,100,000)	(6,460,000)	(6,460,000)	(6,460,000)	(6,460,000)			
Annuities under special acts.....	1,378,000	1,366,000	1,350,000	1,350,000	1,350,000	—16,000		
Government payment for annuitants, em- ployees health benefits.....	40,748,000	40,780,000	40,748,000	40,748,000	40,748,000	—32,000		
Payment to civil service retirement and dis- ability fund.....	71,000,000	72,000,000	72,000,000	72,000,000	72,000,000			
Total, Civil Service Commission.....	150,036,000	153,455,000	151,098,000	151,662,000	151,298,000	—2,157,000	+200,000	—364,000
COMMISSION ON EXECUTIVE, LEGISLATIVE, AND JUDICIAL SALARIES								
Salaries and expenses.....		⁴ 100,000		100,000	100,000		+100,000	
COMMISSION ON MORTGAGE CREDIT AND INTEREST RATES								
Salaries and expenses.....		⁵ 775,000				—775,000		
COMMISSION ON THE POLITICAL ACTIVITY OF GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL								
Salaries and expenses.....	25,000							
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses.....	19,170,000	21,271,000	19,750,000	20,000,000	19,750,000	—1,521,000		—250,000
FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses.....	14,660,000	16,060,000	15,000,000	15,200,000	15,100,000	—960,000	+100,000	—100,000
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses.....	15,281,000	16,127,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	—127,000		

Footnotes at end of table.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND HUD APPROPRIATION BILL, 1969 (H.R. 17023)—Continued

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF CONFERENCE ACTION—Continued

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1968 ¹	Budget esti- mates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill, fiscal year 1969	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill, fiscal year 1969	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued								
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION								
Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service	\$262,715,000	\$278,763,000	\$271,881,000	\$276,763,000	\$275,000,000	—\$3,763,000	+\$3,119,000	—\$1,763,000
Repair and improvement of public buildings	80,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000			
Construction, public buildings projects	66,757,900							
Sites and expenses, public buildings projects	20,285,000	10,995,000	10,995,000	10,995,000	10,995,000			
Payments, public buildings purchase contracts	2,350,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000			
Expenses, U.S. court facilities	1,000,000	1,200,000	750,000	750,000	750,000	—450,000		
Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service	69,596,000	76,534,000	72,500,000	72,500,000	72,500,000	—4,034,000		
Automatic data processing fund	10,000,000							
Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service	17,887,000	18,728,300	18,300,000	18,300,000	18,300,000	—428,300		
National historical publication grants	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000			
Operating expenses, Transportation and Communications Service	6,025,000	6,510,000	6,150,000	6,150,000	6,150,000	—360,000		
Operating expenses, Property Management and Disposal Service	27,572,000	30,500,000	28,500,000	28,500,000	28,500,000	—2,000,000		
Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator	1,793,000	1,944,000	1,820,000	1,820,000	1,820,000	—124,000		
Allowances and office facilities for former Presidents	251,000	267,000	267,000	267,000	267,000			
Expenses, Presidential transition		900,000	900,000	900,000	900,000			
Administrative operations fund (limitation on administrative expenses)	(16,650,000)	(14,165,300)	(13,700,000)	(13,700,000)	(13,700,000)	(—465,300)		
Working capital fund		200,000				—200,000		
Total, General Services Administration	566,581,900	509,291,300	494,813,000	499,695,000	497,932,000	—11,359,300	+3,119,000	—1,763,000
INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses	23,846,000	23,995,000	23,846,000	23,846,000	23,846,000	—149,000		
NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION								
Research and development	3,925,000,000	3,677,200,000	3,383,250,000	3,370,300,000	3,370,300,000	—306,900,000	—12,950,000	
Construction of facilities	35,900,000	45,000,000	21,800,000	34,750,000	21,800,000	—23,200,000		—12,950,000
Administrative operations	628,000,000	648,200,000	603,173,000	603,173,000	603,173,000	—45,027,000		
Total, National Aeronautics and Space Administration	4,588,900,000	4,370,400,000	4,008,223,000	4,008,223,000	3,995,273,000	—375,127,000	—12,950,000	—12,950,000
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION								
Salaries and expenses	495,000,000	500,000,000	400,000,000	410,000,000	400,000,000	—100,000,000		—10,000,000
RENEGOTIATION BOARD								
Salaries and expenses	2,651,000	3,080,000	3,000,000	3,080,000	3,000,000	—80,000		—80,000
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses	17,730,000	17,903,000	17,730,000	17,830,000	17,830,000	—73,000	+100,000	
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM								
Salaries and expenses	64,175,000	—63,568,000	63,568,000	63,568,000	63,568,000			
VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION								
Compensation and pensions	4,605,500,000	4,654,336,000	4,654,336,000	4,654,336,000	4,654,336,000			
Readjustment benefits	427,200,000	617,600,000	612,000,000	612,000,000	612,000,000	—5,600,000		
Veterans' insurance and indemnities	5,150,000	9,350,000	9,350,000	9,350,000	9,350,000			
Medical care	1,361,593,000	1,420,264,000	1,420,264,000	1,420,264,000	1,420,264,000			
Medical and prosthetic research	45,850,000	47,953,000	45,850,000	46,850,000	46,850,000	—1,103,000	+1,000,000	
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses	13,975,000	14,734,000	14,200,000	14,200,000	14,200,000	—534,000		
General operating expenses	189,221,000	198,549,000	195,000,000	197,000,000	195,000,000	—3,549,000		—2,000,000
Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities	52,600,000	33,338,000	7,926,000	7,926,000	7,926,000	—25,412,000		
Grants for construction of State nursing homes	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000			
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines	1,325,000	1,776,000	1,776,000	1,776,000	1,776,000			
Loan guarantee revolving fund (limitation on obligations)	(386,046,000)	Language	(450,000,000)	(450,000,000)	(450,000,000)	(+450,000,000)		
Participation sales authorization	850,000,000	515,000,000				—515,000,000		
Payment of participation sales insufficiencies	665,000	11,580,000	9,505,000	9,505,000	9,505,000	—2,075,000		
Total, Veterans' Administration	7,557,079,000	7,528,480,000	6,974,207,000	6,977,207,000	6,975,207,000	—553,273,000	+1,000,000	—2,000,000
Total, independent offices	13,524,962,650	13,235,084,300	12,197,435,000	12,216,611,000	12,189,104,000	—1,045,980,300	—8,331,000	—27,507,000
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE								
CIVIL DEFENSE								
Operation and maintenance	66,100,000	755,200,000	748,040,000	748,640,000	748,040,000	—7,160,000		—600,000
Research, shelter survey and marking	20,000,000	21,600,000	10,000,000	15,000,000	12,500,000	—9,100,000	+2,500,000	—2,500,000
Total, civil defense, Department of Defense	86,100,000	76,800,000	58,040,000	63,640,000	60,540,000	—16,260,000	+2,500,000	—3,100,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE								
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE								
Emergency health activities	9,000,000	2,400,000			0	—2,400,000		
Total, Title I	13,779,583,650	13,556,057,300	12,440,950,000	12,485,826,000	12,445,169,000	—1,110,888,300	+4,219,000	—40,657,000

Footnotes at end of table.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND HUD APPROPRIATION BILL, 1969 (H.R. 17023)—Continued

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF CONFERENCE ACTION—Continued

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1968 ¹	Budget esti- mates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill, fiscal year 1969	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill, fiscal year 1969	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
TITLE II								
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT								
RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE								
Housing for the elderly or handicapped fund.....	⁸ \$25,000,000	⁹ \$25,000,000	\$25,000,000	\$25,000,000	\$25,000,000	-----	-----	-----
Alaska housing.....	-----	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	-----	-----	-----
Grants for neighborhood facilities.....	30,000,000	40,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000	-\$5,000,000	-----	-----
Urban renewal programs, 1969.....	750,000,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Urban renewal programs, 1970.....	-----	1,400,000,000	(¹⁰)	1,250,000,000	750,000,000	-650,000,000	+\$750,000,000	-\$500,000,000
Low-rent housing annual contributions.....	295,000,000	353,000,000	350,000,000	350,000,000	350,000,000	-8,000,000	-----	-----
Salaries and expenses.....	32,803,600	36,360,000	34,000,000	34,000,000	34,000,000	-2,360,000	-----	-----
Total, renewal and housing assistance.....	1,132,803,600	1,860,360,000	445,000,000	1,695,000,000	1,195,000,000	-665,360,000	+750,000,000	-500,000,000
METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT								
Urban planning grants.....	45,000,000	55,000,000	¹¹ 38,838,000	47,500,000	43,838,000	-11,162,000	+5,000,000	-3,662,000
Open space land programs (appropriation to liquidate contract authorization).....	(75,000,000)	(85,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(-10,000,000)	-----	-----
Grants for basic water and sewer facilities.....	165,000,000	150,000,000	150,000,000	165,000,000	165,000,000	+15,000,000	+15,000,000	-----
Salaries and expenses.....	6,289,200	8,700,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	-1,700,000	-----	-----
Urban mass transportation grants, 1969.....	175,000,000	¹² 15,000,000	-----	0	-----	-15,000,000	-----	-----
Total, metropolitan development.....	391,289,200	223,700,000	195,838,000	219,500,000	215,838,000	-12,862,000	+20,000,000	-3,662,000
DEMONSTRATIONS AND INTERGOVERN- MENTAL RELATIONS								
Model cities programs.....	¹³ 312,000,000	¹⁴ 1,000,000,000	¹⁵ 500,000,000	¹⁴ 1,000,000,000	¹⁵ 625,000,000	-375,000,000	+125,000,000	-375,000,000
Urban information and technical assistance.....	2,200,000	5,000,000	(¹⁶)	2,500,000	-----	-5,000,000	-----	-2,500,000
Community development training programs.....	3,000,000	7,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	-4,000,000	-----	-----
Fellowships for city planning and urban studies.....	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	-----	-----	-----
Salaries and expenses:	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Appropriation.....	1,891,300	1,860,000	1,860,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	-460,000	-460,000	-----
By transfer.....	(2,580,000)	(8,380,000)	(6,000,000)	(6,000,000)	(6,000,000)	(-2,380,000)	-----	-----
Urban research and technology.....	10,000,000	20,000,000	10,000,000	15,000,000	11,000,000	-9,000,000	+1,000,000	-4,000,000
Low-income housing demonstration programs (appropriation to liquidate contract authoriza- tion).....	(2,000,000)	(4,496,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(-2,496,000)	-----	-----
Total, demonstrations and intergovern- mental relations.....	329,591,300	1,034,360,000	515,360,000	1,022,400,000	640,900,000	-393,460,000	+125,540,000	-381,500,000
MORTGAGE CREDIT								
Rent supplement program:	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Increased limitation for annual contract authorization.....	(10,000,000)	(65,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(65,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(-35,000,000)	(+5,000,000)	(-35,000,000)
Appropriation for payments.....	5,000,000	15,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	-3,000,000	-----	-----
Administrative expenses.....	1,100,000	1,600,000	1,350,000	1,350,000	1,350,000	-250,000	-----	-----
Total, mortgage credit.....	6,100,000	16,600,000	13,350,000	13,350,000	13,350,000	-3,250,000	-----	-----
DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT								
General administration.....	4,131,000	8,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	-2,000,000	-----	-----
Regional management and services.....	5,455,200	8,925,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	-2,425,000	-----	-----
Fair housing program.....	-----	⁵ 11,100,000	-----	9,000,000	-----	-11,100,000	-----	-9,000,000
Working capital fund.....	¹⁷ (1,500,000)	2,000,000	-----	0	-----	-2,000,000	-----	-----
Total, departmental management.....	9,586,200	30,025,000	12,500,000	21,500,000	12,500,000	-17,525,000	-----	-9,000,000
PARTICIPATION SALES								
Participation sales authorization.....	2,385,000,000	¹⁸ 1,570,000,000	-----	0	-----	-1,570,000,000	-----	-----
Payment of participation sales insufficiencies.....	23,000,000	⁶ 57,615,000	47,638,000	47,638,000	47,638,000	-9,977,000	-----	-----
Total, participation sales.....	2,408,000,000	1,627,615,000	47,638,000	47,638,000	47,638,000	-1,579,977,000	-----	-----
Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development—Title II.....	4,277,370,300	4,797,660,000	1,229,686,000	3,019,388,000	2,125,226,000	-2,672,434,000	+895,540,000	-894,162,000

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND HUD APPROPRIATION BILL, 1969 (H.R. 17023)—Continued

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF CONFERENCE ACTION—Continued

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1968 ¹	Budget esti- mates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill, fiscal year 1969	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill, fiscal year 1969	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
TITLE III—CORPORATIONS								
ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES								
[Limitation on accounts of corporate funds to be expended]								
Federal Home Loan Bank Board:								
Administrative expenses-----	(\$4,590,000)	(\$5,088,000)	(\$5,000,000)	(\$5,000,000)	(\$5,000,000)	(-\$88,000)	-----	
Nonadministrative expenses-----	(13,650,000)	(14,396,000)	(14,396,000)	(14,396,000)	(14,396,000)	-----		
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation-----	(298,000)	(340,000)	(340,000)	(340,000)	(340,000)	-----		
Department of Housing and Urban Development:								
Housing for the elderly or handicapped-----	(1,272,000)	(1,282,000)	(1,272,000)	(1,272,000)	(1,272,000)	(-10,000)	-----	
College housing loans-----	(2,275,000)	(2,285,000)	(2,275,000)	(2,275,000)	(2,275,000)	(-10,000)	-----	
Public facility loans-----	(1,227,000)	(1,235,000)	(1,227,000)	(1,227,000)	(1,227,000)	(-8,000)	-----	
Revolving fund (liquidating programs)-----	(100,000)	(104,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(-4,000)	-----	
Federal Housing Administration:								
Administrative expenses-----	(11,000,000)	(11,950,000)	(11,500,000)	(11,675,000)	(11,675,000)	(-275,000)	(+ \$175,000)	-----
Nonadministrative expenses-----	(87,000,000)	(95,600,000)	(92,000,000)	(94,000,000)	(93,000,000)	(-2,600,000)	(+1,000,000)	(- \$1,000,000)
Federal National Mortgage Association-----	(9,800,000)	(10,340,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(-340,000)	-----	
Total administrative expenses-----	(131,212,000)	(142,620,000)	(138,110,000)	(140,235,000)	(139,285,000)	(-3,335,000)	(+1,175,000)	(-1,000,000)
Total, new budget (obligational) authority-----	18,056,953,950	18,353,717,300	13,670,636,000	15,505,214,000	14,570,395,000	-3,783,322,300	+899,759,000	-934,819,000
Consisting of—								
Appropriations:								
Fiscal year 1968-----	(13,896,953,950)							
Fiscal year 1969-----	(925,000,000)	(14,843,717,300)	(13,670,636,000)	(14,255,214,000)	(13,820,395,000)	¹⁵ (-1,023,322,300)	(+149,759,000)	(-434,819,000)
Fiscal year 1970-----		(1,400,000,000)		(1,250,000,000)	(750,000,000)	(-650,000,000)	(+750,000,000)	(-500,000,000)
Authorizations to spend agency debt receipts (participation certificates)-----	(3,235,000,000)	(2,110,000,000)				(-2,110,000,000)		
Memoranda—Appropriations to liquidate contract authorizations-----								
	(129,500,000)	(137,096,000)	(122,000,000)	(122,000,000)	(122,000,000)	¹⁵ (-15,096,000)		
Grand total-----	(18,186,453,950)	(18,490,813,300)	(13,792,636,000)	(15,627,214,000)	(14,692,395,000)	(-3,798,418,300)	(+899,759,000)	(-934,819,000)

¹ Reserves under Public Law 90-218 are not reflected, and transfers or releases are excluded.

² Excludes \$11,000 reappropriation provided in Public Law 90-103 (Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1967).

³ Includes \$1,500,000 new budget (obligational) authority.

⁴ Budget amendment in H. Doc. 318.

⁵ Budget amendment in S. Doc. 80.

⁶ Estimated amount of indefinite appropriation.

⁷ Excludes \$500,000 transfer from civil defense procurement fund.

⁸ Additional financing provided through the sale of participation certificates.

⁹ Participation sales authorization.

¹⁰ Not considered by House due to lack of legislative authorization.

¹¹ Excludes \$16,162,000 not considered by House due to lack of legislative authorization.

¹² Excludes \$230,000,000 advance funding for fiscal year 1970. Item transferred to Department of Transportation.

¹³ Includes \$100,000,000 transfer to "Urban renewal programs."

¹⁴ Includes \$500,000,000 transfer to "Urban renewal programs."

¹⁵ Includes \$312,500,000 transfer to "Urban renewal programs."

¹⁶ Not considered by House due to lack of legislative authorization.

¹⁷ By transfer.

¹⁸ Excludes \$25,000,000 new budget (obligational) authority included under "Housing for the elderly or handicapped fund."

¹⁹ It is tentatively estimated that these reductions will result in expenditure reductions of about \$373,000,000 below budgeted 1969 expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good report—a report which reflects great economies and a report which is responsive to the needs of our cities and people throughout the Nation. I urge its passage.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I concur with the views expressed by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. This is a fine report and represents the best effort we could give and the best compromise we could work out with the Senate.

I support the conference report. It is a good report. The total for the bill is \$14,570,395,000. This is \$3,783,322,300 below the budget and is also about \$1 billion under the Senate bill. It is substantially above the House bill, but that is because we had to add \$750 million for urban renewal, which had not been considered in the House because we were waiting for the authorization bill.

I support the conference report and urge its adoption.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the appropriations bill now before us not because it offers the optimum amount of resources

to meet the great needs of our troubled cities, but because it is a bare minimum below which we dare not go. It was necessary to make deep cuts that will seriously affect how well our Nation can respond to the needs of urban areas. Anything less than what is provided for in this bill would make our national commitment to solving the problems of our cities a travesty.

I would point out to you, for example, that the \$625 million included in this bill for the model cities program represents only about three-fifths of what was originally requested. The model cities program which began about a year ago with the naming of the first 75 cities is now at a crucial stage. During this first year we have begun to see the fulfillment of the promise of model cities as an entirely new approach to urban problems.

By the beginning of next year 30 of these 75 cities will have completed their plans. They will have tackled the difficult job of looking deep into the problems of their neighborhoods and setting out strategies to meet those problems. By next June all 75 cities will be into the first action year of their programs. Another 33 cities are just now embarking on the first year of planning. These

cities will soon be joined by an additional 40 cities which see the model cities program as a new path to free themselves from the poverty, dilapidated housing, and frustration of citizens without hope.

What will come from these cities? For the first time they are offered the opportunity to deal with their problems, not as single unrelated parts, but as a whole. They are given the opportunity to pull together fragmented programs in education, job training, health, and housing and make them work together to accomplish broad goals. They are given the opportunity to tailor their own programs to meet local needs rather than have the problems and the solutions dictated to them from Washington. Model cities offers them the chance to go beyond existing Federal programs and try out new approaches.

From a broader national viewpoint model cities will mean several things. First, and most importantly, it will mean more value for each Federal dollar spent in these cities. The concentration of public and private resources in these neighborhoods, the end of waste caused by a series of fragmented and overlapping programs will give a new impact to our national urban effort. Second, these

cities in demonstrating new techniques, can truly become laboratories for experimentation in the solution of urban problems. Their successes and failures will be sources for all other cities to use in meeting similar problems.

The task we have given these cities is not an easy one. The job of working out new relationships with citizens, changing institutions to make them more responsive to the needs of people, and coordinating the numerous activities in the city is difficult. The first year when much of this groundwork must be laid is perhaps the most demanding. In observing the first 75 cities that have been developing model cities plans, I have been impressed and encouraged by their progress.

A truly new spirit is appearing in our tired cities. Suspicious and heretofore alienated residents of poor neighborhoods have overcome their suspicion to move into working partnerships with their city governments. Why? Because they see the model cities program as a workable solution to the problems of their neighborhood. New springs of pride and dignity are flowing in these neighborhoods. No longer are they talking merely of making their neighborhoods better places to live, they are talking of making their neighborhoods the best places to live. They see the model cities program as a vehicle to create neighborhoods that they and their whole city can look to with pride. The city, neighborhood residents and the wider community have been working enthusiastically to forge the plans for a new life in these communities.

But this new enthusiasm, this new pride, this new spirit carries with it a very real danger. Citizen leaders and city officials alike have staked their creditability on this program, and the major question coming from these 75 cities today is, "Will there be enough money to carry out the plans that we have worked so long and hard to produce?" We here in Congress have the grave responsibility for answering that question.

Our answer today must be yes to the \$625 million included in this bill for model cities supplement funds and urban renewal funds. It is not a total answer but it is a start we can make today.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 15: On page 22, strike out "": *And provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for or paid out to the benefit of any individual who at any time after the effective date of this Act, willfully refuses to obey a lawful regulation of the university or college which he is attending or at which he is employed." and insert "": *And provided further*, That if an institution of higher education receiving funds hereunder determines after affording notice and opportunity for hearing to an individual attending, or em-

ployed by, such institution, that such individual has, after the date of enactment of this Act, willfully refused to obey a lawful regulation or order of such institution and that such refusal was of a serious nature and contributed to the disruption of the administration of such institution, then the institution shall deny any further payment to, or for the benefit of, such individual."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. EVINS OF TENNESSEE

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15 and concur therein.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, at this point I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on the independent offices appropriation bill, which among other things, carries funds for the vital model cities program. This program is just 2 years old, and was funded for the first time by Congress about a year ago.

Let me emphasize that the model cities program is not just another federally funded project. It does not merely add more tools or measures to those already available to attack the deep-seated problems of the slums and blight so prevalent today in many of our cities—both large and small.

In sharp contrast to the past fragmented approach to the social, physical, and economic problems of slums and blight, the model cities program launches a large-scale attack on the multiple causes of urban blight and the social damage that accompanies blight and physical deterioration.

The 75 cities now deep in the planning process, and the additional 33 recently selected to move into planning, represent a cross section of virtually every physical and social problem faced by our cities today. The model cities program embraces large communities whose economic base is heavy industry to small towns supported by marginal agriculture.

In our concern for the plight of our cities we must not lose sight of the fact that the model cities program emphasizes human as well as physical rehabilitation.

The tragic disorders that were almost daily occurrences in scores of American cities from border to border were symptomatic of an illness that demands more than quick and easy panaceas. The riots were signals that the disadvantaged and the deprived—regardless of color or race—were deserving of much more than a minimum existence.

Let us look at the practical side. The urban slum not only erodes human potential, but it manifests itself in high local taxes, loss of consumer dollar, and a decline in the Nation's prestige.

There are very sound reasons of conscience and practical economics, that lead to one obvious conclusion—slums and blight must be eliminated. The cost may be high—but if the conditions that

breed disorder are ignored—the costs are well-nigh incalculable. And as a parallel consideration, we can no longer deny entrance to the mainstream of our society of the disadvantaged and the deprived.

In essence, then, the model cities program is an effort by the Federal Government to help large and small communities across the Nation develop and carry out intensive coordinated attacks upon the basic problems of major blighted neighborhoods. In other words, a well-directed attack upon slums and the reasons for their existence.

The model cities program will enable these communities to undertake the major rebuilding and rehabilitation of houses and buildings and building new housing. Streets and schools, and even water and sewer systems will be improved or provided, as necessary. The people in the blighted neighborhoods will be given better police and fire protection, and even improved garbage collection. They will be given better transportation to get them to jobs outside of their immediate neighborhood. A model cities program may also provide supplemental health services, new adult educational systems, job training. But more than this, there will be intensive social rehabilitation.

Bear in mind that the people who live in the neighborhoods that will get model cities treatment are actively and thoroughly involved in planning and carrying out their own program. The people themselves are given a stake in molding the shape of the neighborhood in which they will live and work. This is an entire new departure from the past method of federally aided urban oriented programs.

We recognize that the model cities program is not modest either in cost or potential. The program has been conceived as the basis for a broad national investment in urban reconstruction.

You and I know that all the problems of our cities—joblessness, bad housing, crime and disease, inferior physical and social environment cannot be solved overnight. But we also know that a massive national effort, on the scale of the model cities program, is an effective way of moving into a promising future.

I am not unmindful of the fact that the conferees have agreed on a dollar amount substantially less than that in the administration's budget. But I am mindful of the fact that the model cities program has reached the stage where funds must be available to the cities if they are to progress with their programs in a meaningful manner.

I therefore urge you to accept the conference report. We must keep faith with the people in the cities who look to the model cities program as the start of a bold venture in urban reconstruction.

(Mr. BARRETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS].

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for yielding.

As I read the conference report, there are no funds in the bill for the continuing role of the Department of Housing and

Urban Development in urban mass transportation. While many of the functions of urban mass transportation, particularly with respect to hardware, such as subway cars and buses, and so on, have been transferred—and I think quite properly so—by executive reorganization plan this year to the Department of Transportation, the Department of Housing and Urban Development has retained responsibility for research and development in the nonhardware aspects of urban transportation; that is, what kinds of cities do we need in order to minimize the transportation problem?

I wonder if the gentleman could tell me whether funds will in the future be available to HUD for this purpose and why they are not here now?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. As the gentleman stated, no funds are provided in this conference report for HUD for mass transportation grants. Under the reorganization bill adopted by the Congress, the grants are all under the Department of Transportation. HUD will continue in the planning field. We could not plan the development of cities without planning for urban transportation, so under the division of authority the urban transportation planning will remain with HUD, but the grant program will be administered by the Department of Transportation.

Mr. REUSS. If the gentleman will yield further, do I correctly understand that HUD has already received funds which cover its portion of the mass transit research and development program?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. That is correct.

Mr. REUSS. And that in the future, specifically in the next fiscal year, there presumably will be a request for funds to fund that portion of the total which remains with HUD?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to my friend from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. If my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, will recall, the appropriation bill for the Department of Transportation contained grant funds for the mass transportation program.

Mass transportation had previously been funded in this appropriation bill, but now is a separate appropriation for the Department of Transportation, following the primary intent of the reorganization plan.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 41: On page 48, line 6, insert the following: “, except that during the fiscal year 1969, appropriations of interested departments and agencies shall be available, in aggregate amounts not to exceed those listed herein, for contributions toward expenses of the following committees: President's Council on Youth Opportunity, \$357,000; Interagency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs, \$575,000; U.S.-Mexico Commission on Border Development

and Friendship, \$455,000; National Council on Indian Opportunity, \$375,000.”

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. EVINS OF TENNESSEE

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert “, except that during the fiscal year 1969, appropriations of interested departments and agencies made in this and other appropriation Acts shall be available, in aggregate amounts not to exceed those listed herein, for contributions toward expenses of the following committees: President's Council on Youth Opportunity, \$357,000; Interagency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs, \$485,000; U.S.-Mexico Commission for Border Development and Friendship, \$300,000; National Council on Indian Opportunity, \$100,000.”

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks on the conference report just passed and to include tabular material, and that other Members may also revise their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 5910, LANDS IN TRUST FOR THE PAWNEE INDIAN TRIBE OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 5910) to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Pawnee Indian Tribe of Oklahoma, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of September 16, 1968.)

Mr. HALEY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement of the managers on the part of the House be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

(Mr. EDMONDSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I support this conference report on H.R. 5910.

As a conference on this bill, I have urged that a bill be passed which assures trust title for the Pawnees, as the bill

was introduced by our colleague, the Honorable PAGE BELCHER.

I am convinced the tribe prefers trust title to the 686 acres which this bill rightfully returns to tribal ownership, and am glad agreement on this vital point was reached in the conference. Our colleagues, Senators MONRONEY and HARRIS, were most helpful in securing agreement of the Senate conferees on this point.

I hope and trust the President will speedily approve this bill and assure early tribal use and benefit.

(Mr. BELCHER (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the conference report, which has the unanimous approval of our House conferees.

I introduced H.R. 5910 to return to the Pawnee Tribe lands which rightfully belong to the tribe, and which are surplus to Government needs. The tribe was never compensated for these reservation lands, except for a small portion of the acreage in this bill, and it should not have to pay for their return.

I am glad the other body accepted the House position that the lands should be in trust, as my bill provided from the first. This is only just, and meets with community as well as tribal approval.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE JOSEPH McDONOUGH

(Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, word has reached me of the passing of Joseph McDonough, the circuit court clerk of the county of Cook. Joe was more than a great Democrat. He was a great citizen in our society. He was an American who believed strongly in his Creator, in his country, and in the government that he served. His public record is known to all of us in Illinois, but to those of us who were close to him, his record as an individual man was something that could make one envious. He was admired in his community, respected by his employees, and loved by those of us that were close. We lose in Joe the warmth, the compassion, the understanding that he generated, but he left us a better society because of the effort he displayed as a public official.

To Virginia, his wonderful wife, and to his sons Joseph and John, and to his daughters Mary Grace, and Ginger, I am sure that I express, from our entire delegation in Illinois, our heartfelt sympathy.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 343 I am recorded as not

voting. I was present and voted "nay." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE APPROPRIATIONS, 1969

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1308 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1308

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution, notwithstanding any rule of the House to the contrary, it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 19908) making appropriations for Foreign Assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House now consider House Resolution 1308?

The question was taken

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 293, nays 58, not voting 80, as follows:

[Roll No. 344]

YEAS—293

Adair	Cahill	Eshleman
Adams	Carey	Evans, Colo.
Addabbo	Carter	Evins, Tenn.
Albert	Casey	Fallon
Anderson, Ill.	Cederberg	Farbstein
Anderson, Tenn.	Celler	Fascell
Andrews, Ala.	Chamberlain	Feighan
Andrews, N. Dak.	Clausen,	Fino
Annunzio	Don H.	Flood
Arendis	Cleveland	Foley
Ashley	Cohelan	Ford, Gerald R.
Aspinall	Collier	Ford,
Ayres	Collins	William D.
Barrett	Colmer	Fraser
Bates	Conable	Friedel
Battin	Corbett	Fulton, Pa.
Belcher	Cowger	Fulton, Tenn.
Bennett	Cramer	Fuqua
Berry	Culver	Garmatz
Betts	Daddario	Gathings
Biestler	Daniels	Gettys
Bingham	Davis, Ga.	Gibbons
Blackburn	Davis, Wis.	Gilbert
Boggs	Dawson	Gonzalez
Bow	de la Garza	Goodling
Brasco	Delaney	Green, Oreg.
Brooks	Dent	Green, Pa.
Brotzman	Devine	Gross
Brown, Mich.	Dickinson	Grover
Brown, Ohio	Dingell	Haley
Broyhill, N.C.	Dole	Halleck
Broyhill, Va.	Dow	Hamilton
Buchanan	Downing	Hammer-
Burke, Fla.	Dulski	schmidt
Burke, Mass.	Dwyer	Hanley
Burleson	Eckhardt	Hansen, Wash.
Burton, Calif.	Edmondson	Harsha
Byrne, Pa.	Edwards, Ala.	Harvey
Byrnes, Wis.	Edwards, Calif.	Hathaway
Cabell	Edwards, La.	Hawkins
	Eilberg	Hechler, W. Va.
	Erlenborn	Heckler, Mass.

Helstoski	Mink	Scherle
Herlong	Mize	Scheuer
Hicks	Morgan	Scott
Holifield	Morris, N. Mex.	Selden
Howard	Mosher	Shriver
Hull	Murphy, Ill.	Sikes
Hunt	Murphy, N.Y.	Sisk
Hutchinson	Myers	Skubitz
Irwin	Natcher	Slack
Jacobs	Nedzi	Smith, Calif.
Joelson	Nelsen	Smith, Iowa
Johnson, Calif.	Nix	Smith, N.Y.
Johnson, Pa.	O'Hara, Ill.	Snyder
Jonas	O'Hara, Mich.	Springer
Jones, Mo.	O'Neal, Ga.	Stafford
Karth	O'Neill, Mass.	Stanton
Kastenmeier	Ottinger	Steed
Kazen	Passman	Steiger, Wis.
Kee	Patman	Stephens
Kelly	Patten	Sullivan
Kirwan	Pelly	Taylor
Kleppe	Pepper	Teague, Calif.
Kornegay	Perkins	Teague, Tex.
Kuykendall	Pickle	Tenzer
Kyros	Pike	Thompson, N.J.
Laird	Pirnie	Thomson, Wis.
Landrum	Poage	Tiernan
Langen	Podell	Tuck
Latta	Price, Ill.	Tunney
Lipscomb	Price, Tex.	Udall
Long, La.	Pucinski	Ullman
Long, Md.	Purcell	Utt
McCarthy	Quie	Van Deerlin
McClary	Railsback	Vigorito
McCloskey	Reinecke	Waggonner
McClure	Reuss	Waldie
McGulloch	Rhodes, Pa.	Walker
McDade	Riegle	Watkins
McDonald, Mich.	Roberts	Watson
McEwen	Robison	White
McFall	Rodino	Widnall
Macdonald, Mass.	Rogers, Colo.	Wiggins
MacGregor	Rogers, Fla.	Williams, Pa.
Machen	Ronan	Willis
Madden	Rooney, N.Y.	Wilson,
Mahon	Rooney, Pa.	Charles H.
Mailliard	Rosenthal	Winn
Marsh	Rostenkowski	Wolf
Martin	Roth	Wright
Mathias, Calif.	Roush	Wyatt
Mathias, Md.	Roybal	Wyder
Matsunaga	Rumsfeld	Wylie
May	Ruppe	Wyman
Meeds	Ryan	Yates
Meskill	St Germain	Young
Miller, Ohio	St. Onge	Zablocki
Minish	Sandman	Zwach
	Satterfield	
	Schadeberg	

NAYS—58

Abernethy	Galifianakis	Quillen
Baring	Griffin	Randall
Blanton	Gude	Reid, Ill.
Bolton	Hagan	Reid, N.Y.
Bray	Horton	Schneebeli
Brinkley	Hungate	Schwengel
Brock	Ichord	Steiger, Ariz.
Broomfield	Jarman	Stubblefield
Cunningham	Jones, N.C.	Stuckey
DeJenback	Keith	Taft
Denney	King, N.Y.	Thompson, Ga.
Derwinski	Kyl	Wampler
Dorn	Lennon	Whalen
Dowdy	McMillan	Whalley
Duncan	Minshall	Whitener
Esch	Monagan	Whitten
Everett	Montgomery	Wilson, Bob
Findley	Moore	Zion
Flynt	Morse, Mass.	
Frelinghuysen	Poff	

NOT VOTING—80

Abbott	Donohue	Karsten
Ashbrook	Fisher	King, Calif.
Ashmore	Fountain	Kluczynski
Bell	Gallagher	Kupferman
Bevill	Gardner	Leggett
Blatnik	Giaimo	Lloyd
Boland	Gray	Lukens
Bolling	Griffiths	Mayne
Brademas	Gubser	Michel
Brown, Calif.	Gurney	Miller, Calif.
Burton, Utah	Hall	Mills
Bush	Halpern	Moorhead
Button	Hanna	Morton
Clancy	Hansen, Idaho	Moss
Clark	Hardy	Nichols
Clawson, Del	Harrison	O'Konski
Conte	Hays	Olsen
Conyers	Hébert	Pettis
Corman	Henderson	Philbin
Curtis	Hosmer	Pollock
Diggs	Jones, Ala.	Pryor

Rarick	Roudebush	Stratton
Rees	Saylor	Talcott
Reifel	Schweiker	Vander Jagt
Resnick	Shipley	Vanik
Rhodes, Ariz.	Smith, Okla.	Watts
Rivers	Staggers	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the House agreed to consider House Resolution 1308.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes for the minority to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH]; pending that I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, the House has just voted to consider the resolution which provides for consideration, in turn, of the foreign aid appropriation bill.

Frankly, I do not subscribe to this procedure generally. I do subscribe to this procedure in this particular instance.

This matter was presented to the committee only this morning. The conference report on the authorization bill was adopted only a few hours ago by the House. But it is anticipated that the other body will approve it and that it will go to the White House for the President's signature.

Personally, I voted against that authorization. I voted against that conference report. I personally feel that we have too long engaged in the practice of trying to help everybody in the world.

We are making some progress in curtailment but, as this House is aware, for some time there was no country too rich or too poor, too large or too small, to receive Federal aid from the hands of the taxpayers of America.

I am happy to say that we have made some progress in cutting back in this field, but certainly some day the time must come when we are going to have to look after our own and try to get something bordering on a balanced budget and get some real down-to-earth sanity in our fiscal affairs. However, be that as it may, we are faced with this situation. My own interest in this matter is that I again emphasize the desirability, if not the necessity, for this House to get its business done and for this Congress to adjourn sine die. With that in mind, your Committee on Rules back in June served notice that it would not entertain new bills or bills for legislation that came before it later than July 9 except in cases of emergency or procedural matters. This bill comes within the latter category. So what we are doing here is to expedite the consideration of this appropriation bill so that we will not have to hang around here, if I may use that term, while the other body is talking at length about some other matters. This is an effort to get it behind us so we can either adjourn sine die or, if the situation is prolonged in the other body, so we can recess this House from day to day and let the Members go home and look after their own welfare for a little while. I assume most of the Members of this House are candidates for election and would like to see the people back home, and I am sure

Senate

Sept, 25, 1968

- 3 -

13. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. The "Daily Digest" states that on Thurs. the House will consider the civil service retirement financing bill. p. D868

SENATE

14. APPROPRIATIONS. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 17023, the independent offices and HUD appropriation bill. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. S11393-402
15. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 5117, authorizing funds to construct and operate the Palmetto Bend reclamation project, Tes. p. D867
16. FISHERIES. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) with amendment S. 2553, to authorize modification of operation and relocation of costs of the Kortes unit, Missouri River Basin project, Wyo., for fishery conservation. p. D867
Received a Calif. Legislature resolution inviting representatives of the State Department and the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries to participate in the exchange of scientific information relative to the rehabilitation of the Pacific mackerel resource. p. S11449
17. TAXATION. Received a Calif. Legislature resolution requesting the Congress to enact legislation to eliminate the tax exemption currently granted to American-owned, foreign-registered ships. p. S11449
18. CONSERVATION. Sen. Mondale inserted the text of his news release which points out "that soil conservation activities have one of the best cost-benefit ratios in Government." p. S11433
19. HUNGER. Sen. Pearson spoke in favor of food relief for Nigeria. pp. S11434-5
20. SMALL BUSINESS. Sen. Sparkman commended legislation enacted during the Johnson administration which has broadened the scope of Federal assistance for small businesses. pp. S11435-6
21. CONFERENCE. Sen. Bennett reported that plans were completed for the hemispheric meeting in Utah of the Partners of the Alliance made up of various working committees including the field of agriculture, public health and medicine, business and industry, education, cultural affairs and administration. p. S11441
22. INTERNATIONAL MONEY. Sen. Hartke inserted an analysis of the existing monetary system and called for its reform. pp. S11444-5
23. HIGHWAYS. Sen. Randolph commended the proclamation of National Highway Week and reflected on the contribution of highways to our way of life. pp. S11445-6

24. SECTION 32 FUNDS. Rep. Zwach stated that he will introduce a bill to provide a new use for Section 32 funds - "one aimed at bettering the social and economic conditions of both urban and rural areas" and suggested that FHA would be the agency best equipped to administer his proposal. pp. E8184-5
25. WATER. Rep. Baring inserted a statement, "Our Dwindling Water Supplies and the Purification of Our Polluted Waters." pp. E8186-7
26. HONEY IMPORTS. Rep. Smith, Okla., inserted a progress report on the honey import bill and stated that the Ways and Means Committee "has not found reason to act quickly on this legislation"... "notably due to the total opposition which this bill has faced from the U. S. Tariff Commission." pp. E8188-9
27. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Mize inserted an article, "The Nixon Farm Program", and stated "beleaguered farmers and ranchers across the Nation can take fresh hope from the proposal to revitalize agriculture and rural America..." p. E8189
28. PERSONNEL; RETIREMENT. Rep. Mathias, Md., inserted a speech as to the "serious problem which now exists among the Federal annuitants and survivor annuitants of this country." p. E8190
Rep. Downing inserted L. J. Andolsek's, CSC, speech in which he outlined some of the progressive steps being taken by the U.S. Civil Service Commission. pp. E8190-2
29. DAIRY FARMER. Rep. Thomson, Wisc., inserted Rep. Laird's letter to his constituents, "Letter to a Dairy Farmer: Freeman Farm Policies Unfair to Wisconsin Farmer." p. E8193

BILLS INTRODUCED

30. ORGANIZATION. H. R. 19966 by Rep. Cabell, to establish a commission to study the organization, operation, and management of the executive branch of the Government and to recommend changes necessary or desirable in the interest of governmental efficiency and economy; to the Government Operations Committee.
31. ROADS. H. R. 19968 by Rep. Fallon, to provide that the reduction in expenditures required by section 202 of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 shall not apply to expenditures from the highway trust fund; to the Ways and Means Committee.
32. RIVER BASIN. H. R. 19970 by Rep. Harrison, to require the Secretary of the Interior to undertake certain studies with respect to the importation of water into the Colorado River Basin; to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.
33. LOANS. H. R. 19979 by Rep. Stratton, to transfer functions under various laws relating to the provision of financial assistance for water facilities to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and to transfer functions under various laws relating to the provision of financial assistance for sewerage facilities to the Secretary of the Interior; to the Government Operations Committee.

lishing Company. The matter was referred to this firm by Maurice Rosenfield, Esq., a leading member of the Chicago bar, and this firm was retained by him on behalf of Greenleaf Publishing Company to appeal the Post Office's decision.

We filed a complaint in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to compel the Postmaster General to mail the publication. A temporary restraining order was granted by the Honorable Burnita S. Matthews, United States Judge for the District of Columbia, under which the Postmaster was restrained from refusing to transmit the magazine as second class mail.

We then handled the Greenleaf Publishing Company's application for a permanent second class mailing permit through the Post Office's hearing procedure, through an appeal to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and through the new Post Office hearing which the court ordered. This final Post Office hearing sustained our original position that "Rogue for Men" magazine was not obscene and granted a permanent second class mailing permit. Examination of our files indicates that Mr. Fortas did not participate in this representation of Greenleaf.

2. In 1957, this firm was retained jointly by H.M.H. Publishing Co., Inc., and Greenleaf Publishing Co. to file a brief as Amicus Curiae in their behalf in a case then pending before the United States Supreme Court, *Roth v. United States*, 354 U.S. 476 (1957). The matter was also referred to this firm by Maurice Rosenfield who was counsel for H.M.H. Publishing Company.

As filed, the brief Amicus Curiae was devoted primarily to a discussion of the constitutionality of 18 U.S.C. § 1461. This brief was signed by four members of our firm at that time: Abe Fortas, William L. McGovern, Charles A. Reich and Abe Krash. It was also signed by Mr. Rosenfield as well as by Mr. Rosenfield's firm, Friedman, Zoline and Rosenfield. Messrs. McGovern and Krash had primary responsibility for the preparation of this amicus brief. Mr. Fortas did not participate in the preparation of the amicus brief except as reviewing partner.

These appear to be the only two instances in which this firm ever represented the Greenleaf Publishing Company. In both these matters, our contact with officials of the Greenleaf Publishing Company was always through and in cooperation with Mr. Rosenfield and was limited to preparing materials necessary for the litigation in court and before the Post Office Department.

Corinth Publications, Inc., the company involved in the 1967 Supreme Court case which is said to be successor to the Greenleaf Publishing Company, is unknown to this office. Nor do our records disclose that there was ever any discussion, association or communication between this office and William Hamling referred to in the testimony of Mr. Clancy.

Sincerely,

ARNOLD & PORTER,
By PAUL A. PORTER.

Mr. HART. Second, mention was made of a canon of judicial ethics of the American Bar Association. Highly relevant is another canon, Canon 31. This canon is found on page 6 of the report of the committee on this nomination. The committee footnote comments:

² Canon 31 of the Canons of Judicial Ethics of the American Bar Association clearly contemplates that judges are entitled to receive compensation for lectures and articles on legal subjects. The canon states, in relevant part:

"He [a judge] may properly act as arbitrator or lecture upon or instruct in law, or write upon the subject, and accept compensation therefor, if such course does not in-

terfere with the due performance of his judicial duties, and is not forbidden by some positive provision of law."

I agree with the early comment of my able colleague from Michigan that the burden of proof is on those of us who believe that the Senate should consent to this nomination. That burden of proof will be assumed and can be assumed, but it becomes in order only after the Senate agrees to take up the nomination. That is the question before the Senate. Paraphrasing it, it is something like this: Please let us consider the nomination of Mr. Justice Fortas. Once the Senate is permitted to do this, the case can be made, and the next question resolves: Shall we consent to the nomination?

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1969—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill—H.R. 17023—making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of September 18, 1968, pp. H8886-H8887, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the conference report, and its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the House amendments to Senate amendment No. 41.

These changes allow for the funding in 1969 of four of the smaller groups that would otherwise be prohibited by section 307, as follows:

President's Council on Youth Opportunity, \$357,000;

Interagency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs, \$485,000;

United States-Mexico Commission for

Border Development and Friendship, \$300,000; and

National Council on Indian Opportunity, \$100,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

"except that during the fiscal year 1969, appropriations of interested departments and agencies made in this and other appropriation Acts shall be available, in aggregate amounts not to exceed those listed herein, for contributions toward expenses of the following committees: President's Council on Youth Opportunity, \$357,000; Interagency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs, \$485,000; U.S.-Mexico Commission for Border Development and Friendship, \$300,000; National Council on Indian Opportunity, \$100,000."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not intend to take too much time of the Senate, but this is a large and complex bill. The committee held long hearings. The Senator from Colorado and the other members of the subcommittee and myself have worked on the matter for many months. The bill was ready for conference last July, long before the Senate recessed, and unfortunately the chairman of the House committee suffered some illness. We had to wait until we came back after the recess to have a conference. The conference took place last week.

Many of these items were not subject to great controversy in the conference, but we did have some funding items in the Senate bill—as a result of new authorizations enacted after the House had acted on this bill. These were the subject of controversy. We did agree on some of them—I will put the tabulation in the RECORD. On some of them the House possibly had a good point in suggesting that inasmuch as they did not have hearings on them and inasmuch as they were not before the House when they took up the bill, they could come up in a supplemental bill or be considered as soon as possible.

I yield to the Senator from Mississippi on an item about which we did have a great deal of discussion.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

I shall be brief. I shall not make any motion contrary to the adoption of the conference report.

I have in mind a provision that is included in the bill for \$100,000 to pay the cost of operation of a commission to be appointed by the President. It would be the duty of this commission to consider and recommend to Congress—prospectively to recommend, at least—a change or increase in the salary of Members of Congress and members of the judiciary.

Mr. President, the authorization for this commission was included in last year's salary bill in the House and was not included in the Senate. But it was agreed to in conference and was adopted

later by the Senate and became law. I did not oppose it when the conference report was adopted. Frankly, I did not have an opportunity to know about it. This year I opposed it in the committee—the money part of it—and voted against it on the floor, but I did not get to the Chamber in time to express my views. I wish to express my views now.

I believe it is clear as a bell, under the Constitution of the United States, that the sole power and the sole responsibility of setting salaries for Congress rests with Congress and Congress alone. The Constitution says that compensation shall be fixed by law, and that means the passage of a law. With all deference to those who may think to the contrary, I believe this commission is an indirect method that has been adopted, and we will in effect be failing to meet that issue squarely, even though it is not desirable and is an unpleasant thought to set our own salary. Nevertheless, it is our duty, positive and plain, and I am sorry to say that I think this method evades that responsibility and abdicates our legislative duties and responsibilities.

We talk about the President usurping the power of the legislative branch of the Government, and we talk about the court legislating. And that is the big question before the Senate now in reference to the nomination of the gentleman to be Chief Justice. We blame the executive; we blame the judiciary. Here is something at our own doorstep. I believe we will individually and collectively regret the day we resort to this method.

This issue is not how much we should be paid. That is not the issue at all. The question is, Where does the responsibility lie, and whose responsibility is it? I do not think we can have any doubt, if we think the matter through, that it is our responsibility.

We can go before our people and explain this or that, and we can orate and emphasize and underscore and tell them about the cost of two homes and everything else. But I do not believe we can make one person in 100 believe that it is anybody's responsibility but ours. 99 of 100 people will disagree with us on this point.

I do not desire to hold up action on the independent offices conference report. I have worked with these Senators all year. But I believe that next year we will have to have a second thought about this matter, make up our minds about our responsibility, and decide that we will assume it, unpleasant as it may be, and we will carry this burden. Otherwise, how can we face those of the executive branch and everyone else who wants an increase in salary. If this commission gives us an increase, the doors will be wide open and everything will be running downhill for everything everyone wants.

Mr. President, I protest strongly. I do not subscribe to it. I think it is our duty. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to make one further statement. As the Senator from Mississippi knows I was in sympathy with his viewpoint. However, there was a law which the House and the Senate passed.

I agree that in the next session of Congress we should review the situation

as to whether or not we should repeal that section of Public Law 90-206.

This was merely a matter of the funds to go to the Commission. The members are very eminent men and I think their names should be listed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPOINTMENTS TO COMMISSION ON EXECUTIVE, LEGISLATIVE, AND JUDICIAL SALARIES

The following have been appointed to the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries:

By the President: Frederick R. Kappel (Chairman), John J. Corson, George Meany.

By the President of the Senate: Stephen K. Bailey, Sidney J. Weinberg.

By the Speaker of the House: Edward H. Foley, William Spoelhof.

By the Chief Justice: William Thomas Gossett, Jefferson Barnes Fordham.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this was a continuation of a Commission first appointed by President Kennedy, and which President Johnson continued.

Mr. STENNIS. I make no attack on the Commission or the President. However, with our criticism of the President we turn around and give him the authority.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Whatever they did in the Commission they did under a law.

I know what the Senator from Mississippi is talking about. Probably we should think about repealing the law covering that Commission altogether but the Commission did proceed. The Bureau of the Budget sent up a request for \$100,000. They operate under the law.

The House was adamant on this matter.

I can understand the position of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, no one could express himself more strongly or meaningfully than the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. I agreed to his point of view, as he knows, throughout our hearings and markups on the bill and on the floor of the Senate. I feel very strongly. I do not know how this matter ever got to be a law. Somebody simply overlooked something but it should never have become a law of the United States. It is to our discredit, in my opinion, that it ever did become a law.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It was in the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967.

Mr. ALLOTT. It was in the pay bill. The Senator is correct.

There were so many overriding and important matters in that bill that this matter was not given the attention it should have had at that time.

So the RECORD will be clear, I wish to read one or two paragraphs with respect to what will happen.

(i) EFFECTIVE DATE OF RECOMMENDATION OF THE PRESIDENT.—

(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, all or part (as the case may be) of the recommendations of the President transmitted to the Congress in the budget under subsection (h) of this section shall become effective at the beginning of the first pay period which begins after the thirtieth day following the transmittal of such recommendations in the budget; but only to the extent that, between the date of transmittal of such recommendations in the budget and the beginning of such first pay period—

(A) there has not been enacted into law

a statute which establishes rates of pay other than those proposed by all or part of such recommendations,

(B) neither House of the Congress has enacted legislation which specifically disapproves all or part of such recommendations, or

(C) both.

Mr. President, in this situation what we face is that every 4 years, as a result of this outside commission, which has no responsibility to the people at all—they are not elected by the people every 4 years—they will come up with recommendations for pay increases or pay schedules for Members of Congress, for the judiciary, members of the Supreme Court, members of the Federal judiciary at large, and, I think, the supergrades in the civil service.

Once that group of men, who are not responsible to anybody, does that, and the President includes this in his budget to Congress, then the cold facts are that Congress has to take affirmative action to keep it from becoming the law of the land.

The Senator is entirely correct. We have not only abdicated our rights to the President, the Chief Executive in this matter, we have actually abdicated them to a commission appointed by various people, in part by Congress, in part by the Supreme Court, and in part by the President. We have abdicated our rights to a group which has no responsibility to the people or to the Congress.

It is our duty to do this. This is wholly aside, but as to the question of whether or not the salaries should be raised, I said on the floor of the Senate at the time this was considered, and I said in the subcommittee markup and in the full committee markup and in conference that I think this is the function of Congress and I think we made one of our worst mistakes that we have ever made in passing this legislation.

If a pay raise is justified I am willing to stand on the floor of the Senate and vote for it; and if I am not willing to vote for it, God knows I do not deserve it.

I hope the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service will read these words and the words of the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Washington, and that we will take rapid steps next year to undo this thing which has been done and which I think is one of the most unconscionable things we have ever done in the Congress, albeit not willfully, because this matter was never mentioned, as I recall, during the debate on the pay raise.

For the information of the Senator, what was the situation in conference? As I recall, we had a vote on this matter on the floor of the Senate and I voted in line with his position. I believe the Senator from Washington did, because we had many people on our Committee on Appropriations who felt very strongly about this matter. Nevertheless, by a vote of the Senate, \$100,000 to finance this Commission was put in the independent offices bill.

Despite the fact that this amount was not in the House bill, we found ourselves in the conference with Members of the House of Representatives who were adamant that they wanted this amount.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There was not much we could do about it. The House said, "We recede."

Mr. ALLOTT. At the same time they were insisting on something else. There was no bending. The minute we came to the amendment they said, "We recede." We argued about it. We argued that we did not want them to recede, and we ended up with the \$100,000 in there.

I think that covers the history. The House would not bend. Then they wanted to recede and provide \$100,000. It would have been financed, I am sure, either from private sources or from the President's contingent fund. But that does not get away from the fundamental fact that if this Commission is permitted to continue, we shall be surrendering a power placed in this body and in the other body by the Constitution, not only to the Chief Executive, but also, since he will probably rely heavily on the commission which has been appointed, to a commission which is not directly responsible to the people, as Congress is.

I hope we shall soon see the day when the condition which the Senator from

Mississippi and the Senator from Washington have spoken of will be corrected. Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I feel certain that the Senator from Mississippi, the Senator from Colorado, and I could join in introducing a bill to correct the condition. In the meantime, the Commission cannot proceed with any recommendations, because Congress will not be in session now for any great length of time. Such recommendations would have to be considered at the first session of the next Congress.

But the Senate did vote for this proposal—and we were the agents of the Senate. The vote was 46 to 41 to provide funds when the proposal came up on the Senate floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I wish to join the Senator from Mississippi, the Senator from Colorado, and the Senator from Washington in expressing regret that this item is in the report. The Record should be made clear as to how the proposal originated.

The pay raise bill, of which this item ultimately became a part when the bill came to the Senate from the House, included this provision. The Senator from

Virginia [Mr. Byrd] and I introduced amendments to meet the proposal, but the committee deleted them, and the Senate did not have an opportunity to vote on our proposals. They were not before the Senate, and they were not a part of the pay raise bill as it passed the Senate. Our proposals had been deleted. The item had been included in the conference report and came back as a part of the report at that time.

Both the Senator from Virginia and I, and I am sure other Senators, as well, expressed our regrets and opposition to its being included. So the Record should be clear that the Senate did reject this proposal when it had the chance the first time. They did not do it as a body. It was done in an effort to get the Senate to put it back on the Senate floor. The Senate is not entirely without some responsibility in this matter because when the appropriation bill came over, that was added on the Senate side and passed by a vote, as the Senator said, of—

Mr. MAGNUSON. It was 46 to 41.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, 46 to 41. So the Senate did give its stamp of

approval to it. The opposition was again led by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], and I and others joined him. But it did pass the Senate and we are confronted with it once more. It is unfortunate. It should have been repealed before it ever had a chance to become effective. I shall cooperate with the others to see what can be done about it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We will have a chance to reconsider, but if the Senate voted 46 to 41 for it, we will have an uphill battle.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is true, but the Senate also receded on it when it accepted the House bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the House amendments to the Senate amendment numbered 41.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a tabulation showing the complete actions taken on the bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1969, H.R. 17023

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1968 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS APPROVED IN THE BILL FOR 1969 (H. REPT. 1348, MAY 3, 1968; PASSED HOUSE, MAY 8, 1968; S. REPT. 1375, JULY 9, 1968; PASSED SENATE, JULY 18, 1968)

[Note.—All amounts are in the form of "appropriations" unless otherwise indicated]

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1968 (enacted to date) 1	Budget estimates (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill, fiscal year 1969	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill, fiscal year 1969	New budget (obligational) authority agreed to in conference, fiscal year 1969	Increase (+) or decrease (—), conference action compared with—	
						Budget estimates, NOA, 1969	House bill, NOA, 1969 Senate bill, NOA, 1969
TITLE I							
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT							
NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL							
Salaries and expenses.....	\$524,000	\$524,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	—\$24,000	
OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING							
Salaries and expenses.....	4,700,000	5,043,000	4,850,000	4,850,000	4,850,000	—193,000	
Salaries and expenses, telecommunications.....	1,945,000	1,986,000	1,675,000	1,675,000	1,675,000	—311,000	
Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies.....	3,102,000	3,135,000	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000	—35,000	
Total, Office of Emergency Planning.....	9,747,000	10,164,000	9,625,000	9,625,000	9,625,000	—539,000	
OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY							
Salaries and expenses.....	1,550,000	1,985,000	1,750,000	1,850,000	1,800,000	—185,000	—\$50,000
Energy study.....		500,000				—500,000	
Total, Office of Science and Technology.....	1,550,000	2,485,000	1,750,000	1,850,000	1,800,000	—685,000	+50,000
							—50,000

Footnotes at end of table.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1969, H.R. 17023—Continued

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1968 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS APPROVED IN THE BILL FOR 1969 (H. REPT. 1348, MAY 3, 1968; PASSED HOUSE, MAY 8, 1968; S. REPT. 1375, JULY 9, 1968; PASSED SENATE, JULY 9, 1968; PASSED SENATE, JULY 18, 1968—Continued

[Note.—All amounts are in the form of "appropriations" unless otherwise indicated]

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1968 (enacted to date) 1	Budget estimates (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill, fiscal year 1969	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill, fiscal year 1969	New budget (obligational) authority agreed to in conference, fiscal year 1969	Budget estimates, 1969	House bill, NOA, 1969	Senate bill, NOA, 1969
PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON POSTAL ORGANIZATION								
Salaries and expenses.....	\$1,000,000							
Total, Executive Office of the President.....	12,821,000	\$13,173,000	\$11,875,000	\$11,975,000	\$11,925,000	-\$1,248,000	+\$50,000	-\$50,000
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT								
Appalachian regional development programs.....	126,700,000	213,600,000	108,600,000	178,600,000	173,600,000	-40,000,000	+\$5,000,000	+\$5,000,000
Disaster relief.....	20,000,000	15,000,000	5,000,000	15,000,000	10,000,000	-5,000,000	+\$5,000,000	-5,000,000
Total, funds appropriated to the President.....	146,700,000	228,600,000	173,600,000	193,600,000	183,600,000	-45,000,000	+\$10,000,000	-\$10,000,000
INDEPENDENT OFFICES								
APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses.....	2,745,750	879,000	850,000	850,000	850,000	-29,000		
CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD								
Salary and expenses.....	9,082,000	9,700,000	9,350,000	9,350,000	9,350,000	-350,000		
Payments to air carriers (appropriation to liquidate contract authorization).....	3 (52,500,000)	(47,600,000)	(45,000,000)	(45,000,000)	(45,000,000)	(-2,600,000)		
Total, Civil Aeronautics Board.....	9,082,000	9,700,000	9,350,000	9,350,000	9,350,000	-350,000		
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses:								
Appropriation.....	36,910,000	39,309,000	37,000,000	37,564,000	37,200,000	-2,109,000	+\$200,000	-364,000
By transfer.....	(6,100,000)	(6,460,000)	(6,460,000)	(6,460,000)	(6,460,000)			
Annuitants under special acts.....	1,378,000	1,366,000	1,350,000	1,350,000	1,350,000	-16,000		
Government payment for annuitants, employees health benefits.....	40,748,000	40,748,000	40,748,000	40,748,000	40,748,000	-32,000		
Payment to civil service retirement and disability fund.....	71,000,000	72,000,000	72,000,000	72,000,000	72,000,000			
Total, Civil Service Commission.....	150,036,000	153,455,000	151,098,000	151,662,000	151,298,000	-2,157,000	+\$200,000	-364,000
COMMISSION ON EXECUTIVE, LEGISLATIVE, AND JUDICIAL SALARIES								
Salaries and expenses.....		4,100,000		100,000	100,000		+\$100,000	
COMMISSION ON MORTGAGE CREDIT AND INTEREST RATES								
Salaries and expenses.....		5,775,000				-775,000		
COMMISSION ON THE POLITICAL ACTIVITY OF GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL								
Salaries and expenses.....	25,000							
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses.....	19,170,000	21,271,000	19,750,000	20,000,000	19,750,000	-1,521,000		-250,000
FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses.....	14,660,000	16,060,000	15,000,000	15,200,000	15,100,000	-960,000	+\$100,000	-100,000
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses.....	15,231,000	16,127,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	-127,000		
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION								
Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service.....	262,715,000	278,863,000	271,881,000	276,763,000	275,000,000	-3,763,000	+\$3,119,000	-1,763,000
Repair and improvement of public buildings.....	80,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000			
Construction, public buildings projects.....	66,757,900							
Sites and expenses, public buildings projects.....	20,285,000	10,995,000	10,995,000	10,995,000	10,995,000			
Payments, public buildings purchase contracts.....	2,350,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000			
Expenses, U.S. court facilities.....	1,000,000	1,200,000	750,000	750,000	750,000	-450,000		
Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service.....	63,596,000	76,534,000	72,500,000	72,500,000	72,500,000	-4,034,000		
Automatic data processing fund.....	10,000,000							

Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service.....	17,887,000	18,728,300	18,300,000	18,300,000	18,300,000	18,300,000	-428,300	
National historical publication grants.....	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000		
Operating expenses, Transportation and Communications Service.....	6,025,000	6,510,000	6,150,000	6,150,000	6,150,000	6,150,000	-360,000	
Operating expenses, Property Management and Disposal Service.....	27,572,000	30,500,000	28,500,000	28,500,000	28,500,000	28,500,000	-2,000,000	
Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator.....	1,793,000	1,944,000	1,820,000	1,820,000	1,820,000	1,820,000	-124,000	
Allowances and office facilities for former Presidents.....	251,000	267,000	267,000	267,000	267,000	267,000		
Expenses, Presidential transition.....	(16,650,000)	(14,165,500)	900,000	900,000	900,000	900,000	(-465,800)	
Administrative operations fund (limitation on administrative expenses).....		200,000			(13,700,000)	(13,700,000)	-200,000	
Working capital fund.....								
Total, General Services Administration.....	566,581,900	509,291,300	494,813,000	499,695,000	497,932,000	-11,859,300	+3,119,000	-1,763,000
INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses.....	23,846,000	23,995,000	23,846,000	23,846,000	23,846,000		-149,000	
NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION								
Research and development.....	3,925,000,000	3,677,200,000	3,383,250,000	3,370,300,000	3,370,300,000	3,370,300,000	-306,900,000	-12,950,000
Construction of facilities.....	35,900,000	45,000,000	21,800,000	34,750,000	21,800,000	21,800,000	-23,200,000	-12,950,000
Administrative operations.....	628,000,000	648,200,000	603,173,000	603,173,000	603,173,000	603,173,000	-45,027,000	
Total, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	4,588,900,000	4,370,400,000	4,008,223,000	4,008,223,000	3,995,273,000	-375,127,000	-12,950,000	-12,950,000
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION								
Salaries and expenses.....	495,000,000	500,000,000	400,000,000	410,000,000	400,000,000	400,000,000	-100,000,000	-10,000,000
Salaries and expenses.....	2,651,000	3,080,000	3,000,000	3,080,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	-80,000	-80,000
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses.....	17,750,000	17,903,000	17,730,000	17,830,000	17,830,000	-73,000	+100,000	
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM								
Salaries and expenses.....	64,175,000	63,568,000	63,568,000	63,568,000	63,568,000			
VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION								
Compensation and pensions.....	4,605,500,000	4,654,336,000	4,654,336,000	4,654,336,000	4,654,336,000	4,654,336,000		
Readjustment benefits.....	427,200,000	617,600,000	612,000,000	612,000,000	612,000,000	612,000,000	-5,600,000	
Veterans' insurance and indemnities.....	5,150,000	9,350,000	9,350,000	9,350,000	9,350,000	9,350,000		
Medical care.....	1,361,593,000	1,420,264,000	1,420,264,000	1,420,264,000	1,420,264,000	1,420,264,000		
Medical and prosthetic research.....	45,850,000	47,953,000	45,850,000	45,850,000	45,850,000	45,850,000	-1,103,000	
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses.....	13,975,000	14,734,000	14,200,000	14,200,000	14,200,000	14,200,000	-534,000	
General operating expenses.....	189,221,000	198,549,000	195,000,000	197,000,000	195,000,000	195,000,000	-3,549,000	-2,000,000
Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities.....	52,600,000	33,338,000	7,926,000	7,926,000	7,926,000	7,926,000	-25,412,000	
Grants for construction of State nursing homes.....	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000		
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines.....	1,325,000	1,776,000	1,776,000	1,776,000	1,776,000	1,776,000		
Loans guarantee revolving fund (limitation on obligations).....	(386,046,000)	(450,000,000)	(450,000,000)	(450,000,000)	(450,000,000)	(450,000,000)		
Participation sales authorization.....	850,000,000	515,000,000					(+450,000,000)	
Payment of participation sales insufficiencies.....	665,000	9,505,000	9,505,000	9,505,000	9,505,000	9,505,000	-515,000,000	
Total, Veterans' Administration.....	7,557,079,000	7,528,480,000	6,974,207,000	6,977,207,000	6,975,207,000	-553,273,000	+1,000,000	-2,000,000
Total, independent offices.....	13,524,962,650	13,235,084,300	12,197,435,000	12,216,611,000	12,189,104,000	-1,045,980,300	-8,331,000	-27,507,000
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE								
CIVIL DEFENSE								
Operation and maintenance.....	66,100,000	755,200,000	748,040,000	48,640,000	48,040,000	48,040,000	-7,160,000	-600,000
Research, shelter survey and marking.....	20,000,000	21,600,000	10,000,000	15,000,000	12,500,000	12,500,000	-2,500,000	-2,500,000
Total, Civil Defense, Department of Defense.....	86,100,000	76,800,000	58,040,000	63,640,000	60,540,000	-16,260,000	+2,500,000	-3,100,000

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1969, H.R. 17023—Continued

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1968 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS APPROVED IN THE BILL FOR 1969 (H. REPT. 1348, MAY 3, 1968; PASSED HOUSE, MAY 8, 1968; S. REPT. 1375, JULY 9, 1968; PASSED SENATE, JULY 9, 1968; PASSED SENATE, JULY 18, 1968—Continued

[Note.—All amounts are in the form of "appropriations" unless otherwise indicated]

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1968 (enacted to date) ¹	Budget estimates (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill, fiscal year 1969	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill, fiscal year 1969	New budget (obligational) authority agreed to in conference, fiscal year 1969	Increase (+) or decrease (—), compared with—	
						Budget estimates, NOA, 1969	House bill, NOA, 1969 Senate bill, NOA, 1969
TITLE I—Continued							
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—Continued							
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE							
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE							
Emergency health activities.....	\$9,000,000	\$2,400,000				—2,400,000	
Total, title I.....	13,779,583,650	13,556,057,300	\$12,440,950,000	\$12,485,826,000	\$12,445,169,000	—\$1,110,888,300	+\$4,219,000 —\$40,657,000
TITLE II							
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT							
RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE							
Housing for the elderly or handicapped fund.....	\$ 25,000,000	\$ 25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000		
Alaska housing.....		1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000		
Grants for neighborhood facilities.....	30,000,000	40,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000	—5,000,000	
Urban renewal programs, 1969.....	750,000,000						
Urban renewal programs, 1970.....		1,400,000,000	(¹⁰)	1,250,000,000	750,000,000	—650,000,000	—500,000,000
Low-rent public housing annual contributions.....	295,000,000	358,000,000	350,000,000	350,000,000	350,000,000	—8,000,000	
Salaries and expenses.....	32,803,600	36,360,000	34,000,000	34,000,000	34,000,000	—2,360,000	
Total, renewal and housing assistance.....	1,132,803,600	1,860,360,000	445,000,000	1,695,000,000	1,195,000,000	—665,360,000	—500,000,000
METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT							
Urban planning grants.....	45,000,000	55,000,000	11 38,838,000	47,500,000	43,838,000	—11,162,000	—3,662,000
Open space land programs (appropriation to liquidate contract authorization).....	(75,000,000)	(85,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(—10,000,000)	
Grants for basic water and sewer facilities.....	165,000,000	150,000,000	150,000,000	165,000,000	165,000,000	+15,000,000	
Salaries and expenses.....	6,289,200	8,700,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	—1,700,000	
Urban mass transportation grants, 1969.....	175,000,000	12 15,000,000				—15,000,000	
Total, metropolitan development.....	391,289,200	228,700,000	195,838,000	219,500,000	215,838,000	—12,862,000	—3,662,000
DEMONSTRATIONS AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS							
Model cities programs.....	13 312,000,000	14 1,000,000,000	13 500,000,000	1,000,000,000	625,000,000	—375,000,000	—375,000,000
Urban information and technical assistance.....	2,200,000	5,000,000	(¹¹)	2,500,000		—5,000,000	—2,500,000
Community development training programs.....	3,000,000	7,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	—4,000,000	
Fellowships for city planning and urban studies.....	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000		
Salaries and expenses:							
Appropriation.....	1,891,300	1,860,000	1,860,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	—460,000	
By transfer.....	(2,580,000)	(8,380,000)	(6,000,000)	(6,000,000)	(6,000,000)	(—2,380,000)	
Urban research and technology.....	10,000,000	20,000,000	10,000,000	15,000,000	11,000,000	—9,000,000	—4,000,000
Low-income housing demonstration programs (appropriation to liquidate contract authorization).....	(2,000,000)	(4,496,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(—2,496,000)	
Total, demonstrations and intergovernmental relations.....	329,591,300	1,034,360,000	515,360,000	1,022,400,000	640,900,000	—393,460,000	—381,500,000
MORTGAGE CREDIT							
Rent supplement program:							
Increased limitation for annual contract authorization.....	(10,000,000)	(65,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(65,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(—35,000,000)	(—35,000,000)
Appropriation for payments.....	5,000,000	15,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	—3,000,000	
Administrative expenses.....	1,100,000	1,600,000	1,350,000	1,350,000	1,350,000	—250,000	
Total, mortgage credit.....	6,100,000	16,600,000	13,350,000	13,350,000	13,350,000	—3,250,000	
DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT							
General administration.....	4,131,000	8,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	—2,000,000	
Regional management and services.....	5,455,200	8,925,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	—2,425,000	
Fair housing program.....		11,100,000	9,000,000	9,000,000		—11,100,000	—9,000,000
Working capital fund.....	10 (1,500,000)	2,000,000				—2,000,000	
Total, departmental management.....	9,586,200	30,025,000	12,500,000	21,500,000	12,500,000	—17,525,000	—9,000,000

PARTICIPATION SALES

Participation sales authorization.....	17 1,570,000,000	47,638,000	47,638,000	-1,570,000,000
Payment of participation sales insufficiencies.....	23,000,000	57,615,000	47,638,000	-9,977,000
Total, participation sales.....	2,385,000,000	1,627,615,000	47,638,000	-1,579,974,000
Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development—Title II.....	4,277,370,300	4,797,660,000	3,019,388,000	-2,672,434,000
Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority.....	18,056,953,950	18,353,717,300	15,505,214,000	-3,783,322,300
Consisting of—				
Appropriations.....	18 (14,821,953,950)	(16,243,717,300)	(13,670,636,000)	(-1,573,322,300)
Authorization to spend agency debt receipts (participation certificates).....	(3,235,000,000)	(2,110,000,000)		(-2,110,000,000)
VA.....				
HUD.....				
Total.....	2,110,000,000			
Memoranda—				
Appropriations to liquidate contract authorizations.....	(129,500,000)	(137,096,000)	(122,000,000)	(-15,096,000)
Payments to air carriers.....				
Open space land programs.....				
Low-income housing demonstration programs.....				
Total.....	122,000,000			
Total appropriations.....	18 (18,186,453,950)	(18,490,813,300)	(15,627,214,000)	(-3,798,418,300)
				(-934,819,000)

¹ Includes amounts in 2d supplemental, 1968. Reserves under Public Law 90-218 are not reflected, and transfers or releases are excluded.

² Excludes \$11,000 reappropriation provided in Public Law 90-103 (Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1967).

³ Includes \$1,500,000 new budget (obligational) authority.

⁴ Budget amendment in H. Doc. 318.

⁵ Budget amendment in S. Doc. 80.

⁶ Estimated amount of indefinite appropriation.

⁷ Excludes \$500,000 transfer from civil defense procurement fund.

⁸ Additional financing provided through the sale of participation certificates.

⁹ Participation sales authorization.

¹⁰ Not considered by House due to lack of legislative authorization.

¹¹ Excludes \$16,162,000 not considered by House due to lack of legislative authorization.

¹² Excludes \$230,000,000 advance funding for fiscal year 1970. Item transferred to Department of Transportation.

¹³ Includes \$100,000,000 transfer to "Urban renewal programs."

¹⁴ Includes \$500,000,000 transfer to "Urban renewal programs."

¹⁵ Not considered by House due to lack of legislative authorization.

¹⁶ By transfer.

¹⁷ Excludes \$25,000,000 new budget (obligational) authority included under "Housing for the elderly or handicapped fund."

¹⁸ Includes \$925,000,000 advance funding for fiscal year 1969.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

[Limitation on accounts of corporate funds to be expended]

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1968, (enacted to date) ¹	Budget estimates (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill, fiscal year 1969	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill, fiscal year 1969	New budget (obligational) authority agreed to in conference, fiscal year 1969	Increase (+) or decrease (-) compared with—	
						Budget estimates, NOA, 1969	House bill, NOA, 1969
Federal Home Loan Bank Board:							
Administrative expenses.....	(\$4,590,000)	(\$5,088,000)	(\$5,000,000)	(\$5,000,000)	(\$5,000,000)	(- \$88,000)	
Nonadministrative expenses.....	(13,650,000)	(14,396,000)	(14,396,000)	(14,396,000)	(14,396,000)		
Department of Housing and Urban Development:							
Housing for the elderly or handicapped.....	(298,000)	(340,000)	(340,000)	(340,000)	(340,000)		
College housing loans.....	(1,272,000)	(1,232,000)	(1,272,000)	(1,272,000)	(1,272,000)		
Public facility loans.....	(2,275,000)	(2,235,000)	(2,275,000)	(2,275,000)	(2,275,000)		
Revolving fund (liquidating programs).....	(1,227,000)	(1,235,000)	(1,227,000)	(1,227,000)	(1,227,000)		
Federal Housing Administration:							
Administrative expenses.....	(100,000)	(104,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)		
Nonadministrative expenses.....	(11,000,000)	(11,950,000)	(11,500,000)	(11,675,000)	(11,675,000)		
Federal National Mortgage Association:							
Administrative expenses.....	(87,000,000)	(95,600,000)	(94,000,000)	(94,000,000)	(94,000,000)		
Nonadministrative expenses.....	(9,800,000)	(10,540,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)		
Total administrative expenses.....	(181,212,000)	(182,690,000)	(188,110,000)	(182,690,000)	(182,690,000)		
						(3,335,000)	(-1,000,000)

¹ Amounts have not been reduced to reflect reserves established pursuant to Public Law 90-218. Proposed supplementals and interaccount transfers are excluded.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1969, H.R. 17023—Con.
PERMANENT NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY—FEDERAL FUNDS

[Becomes available automatically under earlier, or "permanent" law without further, or annual, action by the Congress. Thus, these amounts are *not* included in the accompanying bill]

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, 1968	Budget estimate of new (obliga- tional) authority, 1969	Increase (+) or decrease (—)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Civil Aeronautics Board: Payments to air carriers (contract authorization, indefinite).....	\$53,061,000	\$53,211,000	+\$150,000
Federal Power Commission: Payments to States under Federal Power Act (indefinite).....	99,000	99,000	-----
General Services Administration: Expenses, disposal of surplus real and related personal property (indefinite).....	1,000,000	1,000,000	-----
Veterans' Administration: Veterans insurance and indemnities (indefinite).....	650,000	650,000	-----
Department of Housing and Urban Development:			
Urban renewal programs.....	¹ (750,000,000)	¹ (750,000,000)	-----
College housing loan fund (authorization to spend public debt receipts).....	300,000,000	300,000,000	-----
College housing loan fund (participation sales insufficiencies, indefinite).....	10,739,000	12,061,000	+1,322,000
Urban mass transportation grants.....	¹ (125,000,000)	¹ (175,000,000)	¹ (+50,000,000)
Public facility loans (participation sales insufficiencies, indefinite).....	-1,325,000	1,305,000	-20,000
Federal National Mortgage Association:			
Special assistance functions (authorization to spend public debt receipts).....	550,000,000	525,000,000	-25,000,000
Management and liquidating functions (authorization to spend public debt receipts, indefinite).....	82,708,000	-----	-82,708,000
Total, permanent new budget (obligational) authority, Federal funds.....	999,582,000	893,326,000	-106,256,000

¹ New budget (obligational) authority becoming available under prior appropriation acts and excluded from totals.

NOTE.—Amounts as estimated and shown in the January 1968 budget document. Some items are indefinite in amount, and thus are subject to later reestimation.

PERMANENT NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY—TRUST FUNDS

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, 1968	Budget estimate of new (obliga- tional) authority, 1969	Increase (+) or decrease (—)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Appalachian Regional Commission: Miscellaneous trust fund accounts.....	\$1,398,000	\$1,592,000	+\$194,000
Civil Service Commission: Civil service retirement and disability fund.....	3,440,100,000	3,626,500,000	+186,400,000
General Services Administration: National Archives gift fund.....	150,000	100,000	-50,000
National Aeronautics and Space Administration: Miscellaneous trust funds.....	2,688,000	1,548,000	-1,140,000
National Science Foundation: Donations.....	1,000	1,000	-----
Veterans' Administration:			
General post fund, national homes.....	1,820,000	1,790,000	-30,000
National service life insurance fund.....	702,160,000	699,043,000	-3,117,000
U.S. Government life insurance fund.....	49,810,000	44,725,000	-5,085,000
Department of Housing and Urban Development: Federal National Mortgage Association, secondary market operations.....	536,655,000	159,000,000	-377,655,000
Total permanent new budget (obligational) authority, trust funds.....	4,734,782,000	4,534,299,000	-200,483,000

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me say to Senators present that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and the rest of the subcommittee members have to be a little bit immodest about what they do, sometimes, in the economy field, so that the people of this country will realize what is done by this subcommittee.

The Senator from Colorado and I have figured that over the period of the 14 years we have been handling this bill, we have been under the budget figure by some \$9,876 million. I think that is a pretty good record.

We get into a lot of trouble about it. People do not like us to cut out things. But we have, over the years, cut the budget \$9,876 million. This independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriation bill includes the Space Agency which, as we all know, carries a vast sum. It also includes the Veterans' Administration in which most of the costs are fixed. It is very difficult to cut in the Veterans' Administration because, by law, their items are fixed and VA costs have constantly gone up. This year it is \$6,977 million—\$7 billion in round figures. The conference report and the bill also includes HUD and rather large sums for model cities, rent supplements, and urban renewal—and all these other items.

The conference report mainly goes along with the Senate and House bill. We did not compromise too much. It is under the budget figure. I want to repeat

this figure, by \$3,703 million—and the budget was quite austere on some of these matters as it was sent to the Congress.

I want to compliment the members of the subcommittee—I guess that rubs off a little bit on me, too—we have been doing intensive work on this very important and complex bill.

Mr. Cooper and Mr. Dirks, of the staff, have been very helpful to us in this matter.

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes; as well as Mr. Clark, of the minority staff. Mr. President, I want to say this, that the distinguished chairman has referred to these cuts. This can only be done through a long period of intensive hearings with intensive attention given by the members of the committee. I want to compliment the distinguished chairman on this particular matter. The \$3,703 million cut in the bill does not tell the whole story, by any means. It may be that we are patting ourselves on the back a little, but the facts are that when the bill came to us from the House, there were many items that were not in it. In fact, some of the big items—

Mr. MAGNUSON. Participation sales was a big item.

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes, \$1 billion; and in one element of the housing program, \$1,400 million was asked for. Urban renewal and some of these other items were not considered by the House, so that when we got the House bill we were not only faced with trying to find places to

cut, but also had to consider the budgeted items that had been sent to us that were not considered by the House at all. So I think that the committee has done a good job on this and I congratulate the whole committee, except for this one thing which the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] talked about, and in which I am disappointed. I think we have a pretty good bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

SPACE LEADERSHIP

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the Senate is today giving final consideration to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration appropriation for fiscal year 1969 and we are agreeing to an appropriation for the Agency of only \$3,995,273,000, the smallest appropriation for the Agency since fiscal year 1963. Moreover, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget has stated that NASA expenditures will be held to a level \$100 million below that resulting from congressional action and NASA, as an interim measure, is planning an operating budget of about \$3,850 million. During the last 2 years NASA's budget has been reduced by almost 25 percent.

The Government, of course, has undertaken new and great obligations in many fields. Consequently the requirements for the Nation's resources have increased, resulting in a shifting of priorities. Things that a few years ago received little or no attention from the Federal

Government now require enormous annual outlays as the Federal Government plays an active role in solving some of the great problems of our time. But the aeronautical and space activities of the United States are important too, and their importance has not decreased during the last few years. If anything, these activities are more important to the United States today than they were a few years ago. Consequently, it is my view that the budget planned for NASA for fiscal year 1969 is too small and my preference would be to see the NASA budget a little higher than the amount appropriated.

Interestingly, while the United States is slashing its space budget the Soviet space effort gives every indication of increasing activity.

From time to time statements are made that the United States is today behind the U.S.S.R. in space achievements and space capability.

I do not agree that our respective positions are that clear cut. The facts do not justify such a conclusion.

Based upon the information available to me, I believe that the United States has, as of the present, accomplished more in space than the Soviets, even though we experienced a slower start and have not always been first. As I see it, based upon our achievements during the last 2 or 3 years, we are ahead at the present time—but we cannot be complacent about our position for, while we are cutting back our space program, the Soviets with their vigorous space drive as demonstrated by the Zond-5 flight could very well catch up and even surpass us.

The record of relative space accomplishments is as follows:

First. To date, the United States has put 585 spacecraft into earth orbit or on escape missions, while the U.S.S.R.'s total is 334 or 57 percent of the U.S. figure.

Second. The United States has had much greater experience in manned space flight with 1,993 manned hours in space compared with 533 of the Soviets; also 12 hours in extravehicular activity compared with the Soviets' 20 minutes; 16 manned flights compared with nine; and extensive rendezvous and docking experience with manned spacecraft compared with none by the U.S.S.R. On the other hand, the Soviet Union has successfully carried out two space missions involving automatic rendezvous and docking, a highly sophisticated accomplishment of importance in the assembly and supply of large advanced space stations.

Third. The United States has led the way in research and development as well as operational capability with meteorological satellites, communications satellites, and navigation satellites.

Fourth. Not only has the United States had more successful escape missions, that is, payloads to or about the Moon and to the planets, than has the U.S.S.R., but the amount of information obtained in outer space by the U.S. missions has exceeded that obtained by the Soviets. This despite the fact that Soviet planetary attempts have exceeded those of the United States by 3 to 1.

Fifth. This country leads in the collection of scientific information from space and in the dissemination of that information for the advancement of knowledge and the use of mankind throughout the world.

The U.S.S.R. has put into space a larger total of payload weights than the United States and its current trend of space activity is moving upward while the U.S. trend is moving downward. Moreover, throughout most of the period of the first decade of the space age, the U.S.S.R. has had the capability for putting larger payloads into space. Only recently did the United States achieve parity with the U.S.S.R. in big boosters and in fact with the Saturn V has moved somewhat ahead. However, the drastic cutbacks in the U.S. space budget have caused NASA to stop production of the Saturn V even before it has become fully operational; furthermore, NASA has halted the planned development of a nuclear rocket engine. However, the testimony of several witnesses before congressional committees is that the Soviets have a booster larger than the Saturn V under development and are moving close to flight testing it. Only by retaining the Saturn V and building a nuclear third stage which would require development of the nuclear rocket engine can this Nation hope to match the space propulsion capability of the Soviet Union and when all is said and done, it is propulsion capability that is the first order of business when we talk about space.

There is little question but that the United States has at the present time a substantial lead over the rest of the world in the development of nuclear energy for rocket propulsion systems. We should have—we have spent a billion dollars developing the technology. It is incredible that at the moment when we are in a position to exploit this huge investment the space program is cut back severely and a conscious decision is made not to proceed with the development of the nuclear rocket engine.

Mr. President, I do not agree with that decision. In my view it is a mistake not to proceed immediately with the development of the NERVA I nuclear rocket engine. The Congress has strongly supported this development, both authorizing and appropriating funds for the program. The legislative history on the authorization and appropriation bills for both the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Atomic Energy Commission strongly supports the development of a nuclear rocket engine as requested by the administration. In fact the conference committee on the appropriation for independent offices and Housing and Urban Development, 1969, favorably discussed this program. The chairmen of the House conferees and the Senate conferees both stated their support for this program and the House conferees in their statement of managers point out that the Administrator of NASA has the authority and the flexibility within this appropriation to use such funds as may be required to continue the nuclear rocket engine development program—NERVA.

Mr. President, I strongly urge the

NASA to move forward with the development of the nuclear rocket engine, NERVA I, and other basic programs to assure that this Nation will have a pre-eminent position in space during the years ahead.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am most disappointed that this conference report does not contain any money for enforcement of the recently adopted fair housing law. The Senate had included in committee, and approved on the floor, \$9 million for enforcement by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. That at least a reasonable compromise could not have been agreed upon is a serious blow to the cause of human rights in this country.

We see once again that Congress does not mean what it says when it passes substantive legislation, and that Congress can and does speak with two voices when it comes to appropriating the funds to carry out laws already on the books.

This is a repudiation of the will of the Congress which passed the fair housing law by a very large majority in both Houses. The Civil Rights Act of 1968 was a hard-won, but overwhelming congressional mandate to make economics and not race the sole determinant of purchase in the housing market. It also contained a mandate to the Department of Housing and Urban Development to participate in its enforcement through conciliation, mediation, and broadly based educational activities.

A decision not to appropriate funds to fulfill this mandate, in effect repeals that part of the law. This is a breach of faith with those in the black community who preached moderation and reliance in the Congress. It is a breach of faith with all of them who pursued their remedies in Congress and were told by Congress that their cause was just and right.

This cannot be permitted to stand. We simply must appropriate the money required.

I know that Senator WARREN MAGNUSON, chairman of the Senate conferees, fought hard to keep this in the conference bill. I commend him and support him wholeheartedly.

If we are to make any progress at all toward a unified society—and prevent what the Kerner Commission predicts—we simply must live up to our commitments. We have made a commitment in passing that law, a commitment which says that every man has a right to buy the house he wants regardless of his race or color. Not to appropriate funds to enforce, means that we have ignored and nullified our earlier commitment. I simply do not believe that the Congress wishes to go on record as repealing the Civil Rights Act of 1968 less than a year after substantial majorities in both Houses voted for it.

I, therefore, urge every Member of Congress to work for a decent level of appropriations, and live up to our word.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, in reviewing the conference report on the appropriation bill for independent offices, I regret to note that the conferees reduced the appropriation authorized by the Senate for the demonstration cities

program from the Senate figure of \$1 billion to \$625 million, of which one-half is for urban renewal projects connected to demonstration cities.

I also regret that the conferees reduced the Senate figure of \$1,250 million for the regular fiscal year 1970 urban renewal program to \$750 million, which is the same as for the current fiscal year.

I would like to say that I supported the higher Senate figures, because of my conviction of the need for these programs in our urban areas.

I received a telegram from the Honorable Louis B. Nunn, Governor of Kentucky, pointing out that the effects of the proposed cuts results in a serious curtailment of the title IX program in Kentucky cities, handicapping the hard work and long-range planning of Kentucky State officials.

I hope in the next supplemental appropriations bill that the Appropriations Committee will seek to restore some of these funds.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Governor Nunn's telegram be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRANKFORT, KY.,
September 24, 1968.

Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I, as the Governor of Kentucky, join with at least forty three Governors throughout the Nation in support of the title IX Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act. Appropriations to insure continued assistance to local government must not be imitated. Such an elimination would not only destroy a valuable program, but would also pose three major problems to any Governor: A. It would hamper efforts being made to provide a meaningful and continuing program of information and assistance to local communities which neither the Federal, State nor local governments can afford in a start-stop effort of this magnitude. B. It creates a tremendous problem of obtaining and retaining qualified personnel to carry out existing programs when their future is not assured. C. Having one of the few HUD programs destroyed which deals exclusively with aiding local governments in solving their problems creates a tremendous problem to these units of government. Therefore, I strongly urge you to retain the title IX appropriation to insure an uninterrupted program of service to our local communities.

LOUIE B. NUNN,
Governor of Kentucky.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I move that the vote by which the conference report was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, debate today apparently is over, and I ask that we proceed to the routine morning business as in legislative session, under the order previously entered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed under

the order of business for the transaction of routine morning business, as in legislative session.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Under the previous order, the Senate transacted the following routine morning business as in legislative session:

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS—LABOR POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on July 15, 1968, a study by the Subcommittee on American Republic Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations, entitled "Survey of the Alliance for Progress—Labor Policies and Programs" was submitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations in printed form by the staff.

As chairman of that subcommittee, I wrote the preface, which reads as follows:

This is one of a series of studies prepared for the Subcommittee on American Republic Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations as part of a broad survey of the Alliance for Progress.

This study, which deals with the policies and activities of the U.S. Government and the U.S. labor movement vis-a-vis labor in Latin America, was prepared by Robert H. Dockery who was retained by the committee specifically for this purpose. Prior to his service on the committee staff, Mr. Dockery was research assistant in the Department of Economic Affairs of the Pan American Union. The study is based not only in the bibliography set forth in appendix II but also on extensive interviews of government and labor officials.

There is also published herewith a report, "Review of Activities under Contracts with the American Institute for Free Labor Development," prepared by the General Accounting Office at the request of the Foreign Relations Committee. This is an unclassified version developed by the committee staff in cooperation with representatives of the General Accounting Office and the Agency for International Development, of a classified report submitted by the Comptroller General.

The Dockery study and the GAO report are published at this time solely as the basis for discussion and further inquiry. The points of view expressed do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the subcommittee or any member thereof.

WAYNE MORSE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the survey was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SURVEY OF THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS—LABOR POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

(A study prepared at the request of the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs by the staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, together with a report of the Comptroller General, July 15, 1968)

FOREWORD

This is one of a series of studies prepared for the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations as part of a broad survey of the Alliance for Progress.

This study, which deals with the policies and activities of the U.S. Government and the U.S. labor movement vis-a-vis labor in Latin America, was prepared by Robert H. Dockery who was retained by the committee specifically for this purpose. Prior to his service on the committee staff, Mr. Dockery was research assistant in the Department of Economic Affairs of the Pan American Union. The study is based not only on the bibliography set forth in appendix II but also on extensive interviews of government and labor officials.

There is also published herewith a report, "Review of Activities under Contracts with the American Institute for Free Labor Development," prepared by the General Accounting Office at the request of the Foreign Relations Committee. This is an unclassified version developed by the committee staff in cooperation with representatives of the General Accounting Office and the Agency for International Development, of a classified report submitted by the Comptroller General.

The Dockery study and the GAO report are published at this time solely as the basis for discussion and further inquiry. The points of view expressed do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the subcommittee or any member thereof.

WAYNE MORSE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs.

PART I—LABOR POLICIES

I. Salient features of the Latin American labor movement

To describe the Latin American labor situation is to describe Latin American society: weak, illiterate, undernourished, ill housed, discontented, restless, reform-minded—in a word, "underdeveloped," with all of its less desirable connotations.

This is a logical result of the economic situation which Latin American labor has traditionally confronted: the business community characterized by the family-type enterprise; a low level of industrialization, and the maintenance of a feudal agricultural system—all of which combine to place severe limitations on employment opportunities, as is indicated in the following observation by Frank Bonilla:

"Only a small fraction of the work force is in industry and of those in industry only a small proportion have industrial skills or work in plants that can be regarded as 'modern' in size, technology, or management. The small proprietary enterprise, family firm, and partnership remain dominant, not only in number, but in the proportion of the work force they absorb and the total value of their production. The average wage earner is unskilled, and only marginally or insecurely employed in menial services or unspecialized tasks in construction and manufacturing. The high proportion of 'self-employed' persons to some extent merely masks unemployment, and the dissipation of considerable entrepreneurial talent and drive in a ferocious and often degrading competition to stay alive. Legally fixed low wage scales, the abundant labor supply, and inflation that is chronic when not acute create a treadmill on which the worker must constantly struggle for no more than a subsistence wage. Sharp differentials in wage scales and bargaining power between skilled and unskilled workers, and between blue-collar and white-collar (including technical and lower management) occupations, serve to block effective working-class solidarity. The existence not only of separate unions, but also of wholly separate machinery for dealing with the different labor categories within certain firms and governments is a further barrier to labor unity."

Thus, the trade union organizations which do exist tend to resemble small-scale political parties rather than the trade union

Footnotes at end of article.



Public Law 90-550
90th Congress, H. R. 17023
October 4, 1968

An Act

82 STAT 937

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, namely:

Independent
Offices and
Department of
Housing and
Urban Develop-
ment Appropri-
ation Act, 1969.

TITLE I

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the National Aeronautics and Space Council, established by section 201 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2471), including hire of passenger motor vehicles, reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services, and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$500,000.

72 Stat. 427;
75 Stat. 46.

80 Stat. 416.

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Office of Emergency Planning, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services, hire of passenger motor vehicles, and expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and individuals at meetings concerned with the work of emergency planning, \$4,850,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, TELECOMMUNICATIONS

For expenses necessary for the conduct of telecommunications functions assigned to the Director of Telecommunications Management, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$1,675,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$500,000 of the foregoing amount shall remain available for telecommunications studies and research until expended.

CIVIL DEFENSE AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION FUNCTIONS OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

For expenses necessary to assist other Federal agencies to perform civil defense and defense mobilization functions, including payments by the Department of Labor to State employment security agencies for the full cost of administration of defense manpower mobilization activities, \$3,100,000.

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

80 Stat. 416. For expenses necessary for the Office of Science and Technology, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C 3109, \$1,800,000.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

79 Stat. 5;
81 Stat. 257.
40 USC app. 1. For expenses necessary to carry out the programs authorized by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended, except expenses authorized by section 105 of said Act, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$173,600,000, to remain available until expended.

DISASTER RELIEF

64 Stat. 1109.
80 Stat. 1320.
42 USC 1855ee. For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1855-1855g) and section 9 of the Disaster Relief Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-769), authorizing assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed 3 per centum of the foregoing amount shall be available for administrative expenses.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Cochairman and his alternate on the Appalachian Regional Commission and for payment of the Federal share of the administrative expenses of the Commission, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$850,000.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

80 Stat. 508;
81 Stat. 206. For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board, including hire of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902); and not to exceed \$1,000 for official reception and representation expenses, \$9,350,000.

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

72 Stat. 763. For payments to air carriers of so much of the compensation fixed and determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board under section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1376), as is payable by the Board, \$45,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; not to exceed \$10,000 for medical examinations performed for veterans by private physicians on a fee basis; payment in advance for library membership in societies whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public; not to exceed \$161,000 for performing the duties imposed upon the Commission by chapter 15 of title 5, United States Code; and not to exceed \$1,000 for official reception and representation expenses; \$37,200,000, including funding of Interagency Boards of Examiners, together with not to exceed \$6,460,000 for necessary expenses incurred during the current fiscal year in the administration of the retirement and insurance programs, to be transferred from the trust funds "Civil Service retirement and disability fund", "Employees life insurance fund", "Employees health benefits fund", and "Retired employees health benefits fund", in such amounts as may be determined by the Civil Service Commission, without regard to the provisions of any other Act, but this provision shall not affect the authority of 5 U.S.C. 8348(a) and section 1(b) of Public Law 89-205 (79 Stat. 840), providing for additional administrative expenses to effect annuity adjustments under 5 U.S.C. 8340, section 1(c) of Public Law 89-205 (79 Stat. 840) and section 1 of Public Law 89-314 (79 Stat. 1162): *Provided*, That \$700,000 of this appropriation shall be available to carry out the provisions of Executive Order 10422 of January 9, 1953, as amended, prescribing procedures for making available to the Secretary General of the United Nations, and the executive heads of other international organizations, certain information concerning United States citizens employed, or being considered for employment by such organizations, including advances or reimbursements to the applicable appropriations or funds of the Civil Service Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation for expenses incurred by such agencies under said Executive Order: *Provided further*, That members of the International Organizations Employees Loyalty Board may be paid actual transportation expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence under 5 U.S.C. 5702, while traveling on official business away from their homes or regular places of business, including periods while en route to and from and at the place where their services are to be performed.

No part of the appropriations herein made to the Civil Service Commission shall be available for the salaries and expenses of the Legal Examining Unit in the Examining and Personnel Utilization Division of the Commission, established pursuant to Executive Order 9358 of July 1, 1943.

ANNUITIES UNDER SPECIAL ACTS

For payment of annuities authorized by the Act of May 29, 1944, as amended (48 U.S.C. 1373a), and the Act of August 19, 1950, as amended (33 U.S.C. 771-775), \$1,350,000.

GOVERNMENT PAYMENT FOR ANNUITANTS, EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS

For payment of Government contributions with respect to retired employees, as authorized by chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, and the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act (74 Stat. 849), as amended, \$40,748,000, to remain available until expended.

80 Stat. 416.

80 Stat. 403.
5 USC 1501-
1508.

81 Stat. 218.

81 Stat. 215.

22 USC 287
note.

80 Stat. 498.

3 CFR 1943-
1948 comp.,
p. 256.58 Stat. 257;
70 Stat. 607.
64 Stat. 465;
81 Stat. 518,
520.80 Stat. 599;
81 Stat. 219.
5 USC 8901-
8913.

PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

For financing the estimated cost of new and increased annuity benefits, during the current fiscal year, as provided by part III of Public Law 87-793 (76 Stat. 868), \$72,000,000, to be credited to the civil service retirement and disability fund.

COMMISSION ON EXECUTIVE, LEGISLATIVE, AND JUDICIAL SALARIES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries, authorized by section 225 of the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967 (81 Stat. 642-645), \$100,000.

2 USC 351-
361.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in performing the duties of the Commission as authorized by law, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902); not to exceed \$41,000 for land and structures; not to exceed \$11,000 for improvement and care of grounds and repairs to buildings; not to exceed \$500 for official reception and representation expenses; special counsel fees; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; and purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only, \$19,750,000.

80 Stat. 508;
81 Stat. 206.

80 Stat. 416.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the work of the Commission, as authorized by law, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and not to exceed \$500 for official reception and representation expenses, \$15,100,000.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commission, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902), and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$16,000,000. *Provided.* That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be expended upon any investigation hereafter provided by concurrent resolution of the Congress until funds are appropriated subsequently to the enactment of such resolution to finance the cost of such investigation.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

OPERATING EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of real property management and related activities as provided by law; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia; restoration of leased premises; moving Government agencies (including space adjustments) in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer of building space; acquisition by purchase or otherwise of real estate and interests therein; and contractual services incident to cleaning or servicing

buildings and moving; \$275,000,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available to provide such fencing, lighting, guard booths, and other facilities on private or other property not in Government ownership or control as may be appropriate to enable the United States Secret Service to perform its protective functions pursuant to title 18, U.S.C. 3056.

REPAIR AND IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to alter public buildings and to acquire additions to sites pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479) and to alter other Federally-owned buildings and to acquire additions to sites thereof, including grounds, approaches and appurtenances, wharves and piers, together with the necessary dredging adjacent thereto; and care and safeguarding of sites; preliminary planning of projects by contract or otherwise; maintenance, preservation, demolition, and equipment; \$80,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That for the purposes of this appropriation, buildings constructed pursuant to the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356) and the Post Office Department Property Act of 1954 (39 U.S.C. 2104 et seq.), and buildings under the control of another department or agency where alteration of such buildings is required in connection with the moving of such other department or agency from buildings then, or thereafter to be, under the control of General Services Administration shall be considered to be public buildings.

40 USC 601
note.

68 Stat. 518.
74 Stat. 590.

SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

For an additional amount for expenses necessary in connection with the construction of public buildings projects not otherwise provided for, as specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts of 1959 and 1960, including preliminary planning of public buildings projects by contract or otherwise, \$10,995,000, to remain available until expended.

72 Stat. 1066;
73 Stat. 505.

PAYMENTS, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PURCHASE CONTRACTS

For payments of principal, interest, taxes, and any other obligations under contracts entered into pursuant to the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356), \$2,400,000.

EXPENSES, UNITED STATES COURT FACILITIES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, to provide directly or indirectly, additional space for the United States Courts incident to expansion of facilities (including rental of buildings in the District of Columbia and elsewhere and moving and space adjustments), and furniture and furnishings, \$750,000.

OPERATING EXPENSES, FEDERAL SUPPLY SERVICE

For expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary for supply distribution, procurement, inspection, operation of the stores depot system (including contractual services incident to receiving, handling, and shipping warehouse items), and other supply management and related activities, as authorized by law, \$72,500,000.

OPERATING EXPENSES, NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE

For necessary expenses in connection with Federal records management and related activities, as provided by law, including reimbursement for security guard services, and contractual services incident to movement or disposal of records, \$18,300,000.

NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS GRANTS

For allocation to Federal agencies, and for grants to State and local agencies and nonprofit organizations and institutions, for the collecting, describing, preserving and compiling, and publishing of documentary sources significant to the history of the United States, \$350,000, to remain available until expended.

OPERATING EXPENSES, TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE

80 Stat. 416. For necessary expenses of transportation, communications, and other public utilities management and related activities, as provided by law, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$6,150,000.

OPERATING EXPENSES, PROPERTY MANAGEMENT AND DISPOSAL SERVICE

60 Stat. 596. For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for carrying out the functions of the Administrator with respect to the utilization of excess property; the disposal of surplus property; the rehabilitation of personal property; the appraisal of real and personal property; the national stockpile established by the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98-98h); the supplemental stockpile established by section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 456, as amended by 73 Stat. 607); the national industrial reserve established by the National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451-462); including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and reimbursement for security guard services, \$28,500,000, to be derived from proceeds from transfers of excess property, disposal of surplus property, and sales of stockpile materials: *Provided*. That during the current fiscal year the General Services Administration is authorized to acquire leasehold interests in property, for periods not in excess of twenty years, for the storage, security, and maintenance of strategic, critical, and other materials in the national and supplemental stockpiles provided said leasehold interests are at nominal cost to the Government: *Provided further*. That during the current fiscal year there shall be no limitation on the value of surplus strategic and critical materials which, in accordance with section 6 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98e), may be transferred without reimbursement to the national stockpile: *Provided further*. That during the current fiscal year materials in the inventory maintained under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2061-2166), and excess materials in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, the disposition of which is authorized by law, shall be available, without reimbursement, for transfer at fair market value to contractors as payment for expenses (including transportation and other accessorial expenses) of acquisition of materials, or of refining, processing, or otherwise beneficiating materials, or of rotating materials, pursuant to section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b), and of processing and refining materials pursuant to section 303(d) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2093(d)).

7 USC 1704
note.
62 Stat. 1225.

64 Stat. 798.

65 Stat. 134.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

For expenses of executive direction for activities under the control of the General Services Administration, \$1,820,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$500 shall be available for reception and representation expenses.

ALLOWANCES AND OFFICE FACILITIES FOR FORMER PRESIDENTS

For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 838), \$267,000: *Provided*, That the Administrator of General Services shall transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of sections (a) and (e) of such Act.

81 Stat. 642.
3 USC 102 note.

EXPENSES, PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Presidential Transition Act of 1963 (3 U.S.C. 102, note), \$900,000, to remain available until June 30, 1970.

78 Stat. 153.

ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS FUND

Funds available to General Services Administration for administrative operations, in support of program activities, shall be expended and accounted for, as a whole, through a single fund: *Provided*, That costs and obligations for such administrative operations for the respective program activities shall be accounted for in accordance with systems approved by the General Accounting Office: *Provided further*, That the total amount deposited into said account for the current fiscal year from funds made available to General Services Administration in this Act shall not exceed \$13,700,000: *Provided further*, That amounts deposited into said account for administrative operations for each program shall not exceed the amounts included in the respective program appropriations for such purposes.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The appropriate appropriation or fund available to the General Services Administration shall be credited with (1) cost of operation, protection, maintenance, upkeep, repair, and improvement, included as part of rentals received from Government corporations pursuant to law (40 U.S.C. 129); (2) reimbursements for services performed in respect to bonds and other obligations under the jurisdiction of the General Services Administration, issued by public authorities, States, or other public bodies, and such services in respect to such bonds or obligations as the Administrator deems necessary and in the public interest may, upon the request and at the expense of the issuing agencies, be provided from the appropriate foregoing appropriation; and (3) appropriations or funds available to other agencies, and transferred to the General Services Administration, in connection with property transferred to the General Services Administration pursuant to the Act of July 2, 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451ff), and such appropriations or funds may be so transferred, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

61 Stat. 584.

62 Stat. 1225.
50 USC 451
note.

Appropriations to the General Services Administration under the heading "Construction, Public Buildings Projects" shall be available, subject to the provisions of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 for (1) acquisition of buildings and sites thereof by purchase, condemnation,

73 Stat. 479.
40 USC 601
note.

or otherwise, including prepayment of purchase contracts, (2) extension or conversion of Government-owned buildings, and (3) construction of new buildings, in addition to those set forth under that appropriation: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall authorize an expenditure of funds for acquisition, extension or conversion, or construction without the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Funds available to the General Services Administration shall be available for the hire of passenger motor vehicles.

No part of any money appropriated by this or any other Act for any agency of the executive branch of the Government shall be used during the current fiscal year for the purchase within the continental limits of the United States of any typewriting machines except in accordance with regulations issued pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

63 Stat. 377.
40 USC 471 note.
Transfers of
funds.

Not to exceed 2 per centum of any appropriation made available to the General Services Administration for the current fiscal year by this Act may be transferred to any other such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be increased thereby more than 2 per centum. *Provided*, That such transfers shall apply only to operating expenses, and shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount of \$2,000,000.

40 USC 601 note.

Appropriations available to any department or agency during the current fiscal year for necessary expenses, including maintenance or operating expenses, shall also be available for (a) reimbursement to the General Services Administration for those expenses of renovation and alteration of buildings and facilities which constitute public improvements, performed in accordance with the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479) or other applicable law, and (b) transfer or reimbursement to applicable appropriations to said Administration for rents and related expenses, not otherwise provided for, of providing subject to Executive Order 11035, dated July 9, 1962, directly or indirectly, suitable general purpose space for any such department or agency, in the District of Columbia or elsewhere.

40 USC 490 note.

No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for the payment of rental on lease agreements for the accommodation of Federal agencies in buildings and improvements which are to be erected by the lessor for such agencies at an estimated cost of construction in excess of \$200,000 or for the payment of the salary of any person who executes such a lease agreement: *Provided*, That the foregoing proviso shall not be applicable to projects for which a prospectus for the lease construction of space has been submitted to the Congress and approval made in the same manner as for the public buildings construction projects pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

80 Stat. 416.

For necessary expenses of the Interstate Commerce Commission, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$23,846,000, of which \$150,000 shall be available for valuation of pipelines: *Provided*, That Joint Board members and cooperating State commissioners may use Government transportation requests when traveling in connection with their duties as such.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, including research, development, operations, services, minor construction, supplies, materials, equipment; maintenance, repair, and alteration of real and personal property; and purchase, hire, maintenance, and operation of other than administrative aircraft necessary for the conduct and support of aeronautical and space research and development activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, \$3,370,300,000, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

For advance planning, design, and construction of facilities for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and for the acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law, \$1,800,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses of operation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, not otherwise provided for, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902); minor construction; supplies, materials, services, and equipment; awards; hire, maintenance and operation of administrative aircraft; purchase (not to exceed ten for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and maintenance, repair, and alteration of real and personal property; \$603,173,000: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into under this appropriation for maintenance and operation of facilities, and for other services, to be provided during the next fiscal year.

80 Stat. 508;
81 Stat. 206.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act may be transferred to any other such appropriation.

Transfer of
funds.

Not to exceed \$35,000 of the appropriation "Administrative Operations" in this Act for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be available for scientific consultations or extraordinary expense, to be expended upon the approval or authority of the Administrator and his determination shall be final and conclusive.

Scientific
consultations,
etc.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861-1875) Title IX of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (42 U.S.C. 1876-1879), the National Sea Grant Colleges and Program Act of 1966 (80 Stat. 998), and the Act to establish a National Medal of Science (42 U.S.C. 1880-1881), including award of graduate fellowships; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; maintenance and operation of three aircraft and purchase of flight services for research

64 Stat. 149.
72 Stat. 1601.
33 USC 1121
note.
73 Stat. 431.
80 Stat. 416.

80 Stat. 508;
81 Stat. 206.

support; hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed \$2,500 for official reception and representation expenses; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902); rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; \$400,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the foregoing amount not less than \$37,600,000 shall be available for tuition, grants, and allowances in connection with a program of supplementary training for secondary school science and mathematics teachers: *Provided further*, That receipts for scientific support services and materials furnished by the National Research Centers may be credited to this appropriation: *And provided further*, That if an institution of higher education receiving funds hereunder determines after affording notice and opportunity for hearing to an individual attending, or employed by, such institution, that such individual has, after the date of enactment of this Act, willfully refused to obey a lawful regulation or order of such institution and that such refusal was of a serious nature and contributed to the disruption of the administration of such institution, then the institution shall deny any further payment to, or for the benefit of, such individual.

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Renegotiation Board, including hire of passenger motor vehicles and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$3,000,000.

80 Stat. 416.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902), and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$17,830,000.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Selective Service System, as authorized by title I of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 (62 Stat. 604), as amended, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; expenses of attendance at meetings and of training for uniformed personnel assigned to the Selective Service System, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2301-2318) for civilian employees; hire of motor vehicles; purchase of thirteen passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; not to exceed \$71,000 for the National Selective Service Appeal Board; and \$60,000 for the National Advisory Committee on the Selection of Physicians, Dentists, and Allied Specialists; \$63,568,000: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year, the President may exempt this appropriation from the provisions of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, whenever he deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national defense.

81 Stat. 100.
50 USC app.
451.
80 Stat. 432.
5 USC 4101-
4118 and notes.

31 USC 665.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

For the payment of compensation, pensions, gratuities, and allowances, including burial awards, burial flags, subsistence allowances for vocational rehabilitation, emergency and other officers' retirement pay, adjusted-service credits and certificates, as authorized by law; and for payment of amounts of compromises or settlements under 28 U.S.C. 2677 of tort claims potentially subject to the offset provisions of 38 U.S.C. 351, \$4,654,336,000, to remain available until expended.

80 Stat. 307.
72 Stat. 1124;
76 Stat. 950.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

For the payment of readjustment and rehabilitation benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. chapters 21, 31 (except section 1504), and 33-39), \$612,000,000, to remain available until expended.

72 Stat. 1167;
80 Stat. 12-28.
38 USC 801,
1501-1905.

VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

For military and naval insurance, national service life insurance, servicemen's indemnities, and service-disabled veterans insurance, to remain available until expended, \$11,850,000, of which \$2,500,000 shall be derived from the Veterans Special Term Insurance Fund.

MEDICAL CARE

For expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of hospitals, nursing homes, and domiciliary facilities; for furnishing, as authorized by law, inpatient and outpatient care and treatment to beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration including care and treatment in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration, and furnishing recreational facilities, supplies and equipment; maintenance and operation of farms and burial grounds; repairing, altering, improving or providing facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration, not otherwise provided for, either by contract or by the hire of temporary employees and purchase of materials; uniforms or allowance therefor as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902); and aid to State homes as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 641); \$1,420,264,000, plus reimbursements: *Provided*, That allotments and transfers may be made from this appropriation to the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Army, Navy, and Air Force of the Department of Defense, for disbursements by them under the various headings of their applicable appropriations, of such amounts as are necessary for the care and treatment of beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration.

80 Stat. 508;
81 Stat. 206.
78 Stat. 500.

MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH

For expenses necessary for carrying out programs of medical and prosthetic research and development, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, \$46,850,000.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS OPERATING EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for administration of the medical, hospital, domiciliary, construction and supply, research, employee education and training activities, as authorized by law, and for carrying out the provisions of section 5055, title 38, United States Code, relating to

80 Stat. 1375.

pilot programs and grants for exchange of medical information, \$14,200,000.

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary operating expenses of the Veterans Administration, not otherwise provided for, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law; not to exceed \$1,000 for official reception and representation expenses; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle (medium sedan for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; \$195,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay in excess of twenty-two persons engaged in public relations work.

CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY FACILITIES

For hospital and domiciliary facilities, for planning and for major alterations, improvements, and repairs and extending any of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 5001, 5002, and 5004, title 38, United States Code, including necessary expenses of administration, \$7,926,000, to remain available until expended.

72 Stat. 1251;
80 Stat. 1372.

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF STATE NURSING HOMES

For grants to assist the several States to construct State home facilities for furnishing nursing home care to veterans, as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 5031-5037), \$4,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1971.

78 Stat. 501.

GRANTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

For payment to the Republic of the Philippines of grants, as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 631-634), \$1,776,000.

72 Stat. 1145;
80 Stat. 859.

LOAN GUARANTY REVOLVING FUND

During the current fiscal year, the Loan guaranty revolving fund shall be available for expenses, but not to exceed \$450,000,000, for property acquisitions and other loan guaranty and insurance operations under Chapter 37, title 38, United States Code, except administrative expenses, as authorized by section 1824 of such title: *Provided*, That the unobligated balances including retained earnings of the Direct loan revolving fund shall be available, during the current fiscal year, for transfer to the Loan guaranty revolving fund in such amounts as may be necessary to provide for the timely payment of obligations of such fund and the Administrator of Veterans Affairs shall not be required to pay interest on amounts so transferred after the time of such transfer.

72 Stat. 1203;
80 Stat. 26.
38 USC 1801-
1826.
74 Stat. 533.

PAYMENT OF PARTICIPATION SALES INSUFFICIENCIES

For the payment of such insufficiencies as may be required by the Federal National Mortgage Association, as trustee, on account of outstanding beneficial interests or participations in Direct Loan Revolving Fund assets or Loan Guaranty Revolving Fund assets authorized by law to be issued pursuant to section 302(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act, as amended, \$9,505,000.

78 Stat. 800;
80 Stat. 164,
1236.
12 USC 1717.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation for the current fiscal year for "Compensation and pensions", "Readjustment benefits", and "Veterans insurance and indemnities" may be transferred to any other of the mentioned appropriations, but not to exceed 10 per centum of the appropriations so augmented.

Appropriations available to the Veterans Administration for the current fiscal year for salaries and expenses shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

80 Stat. 416.

The appropriation available to the Veterans Administration for the current fiscal year for "Medical care" shall be available for funeral, burial, and other expenses incidental thereto (except burial awards authorized by 38 U.S.C. 902), for beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration receiving care under such appropriations.

72 Stat. 1169;
80 Stat. 29.

No part of the appropriations in this Act for the Veterans Administration (except the appropriation for "Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities") shall be available for the purchase of any site for or toward the construction of any new hospital or home.

No part of the foregoing appropriations shall be available for hospitalization or examination of any persons except beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such benefits to veterans, unless reimbursement of cost is made to the appropriation at such rates as may be fixed by the Administrator of Veterans Affairs.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

CIVIL DEFENSE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for carrying out civil defense activities, including the hire of motor vehicles; and financial contributions to the States for civil defense purposes, as authorized by law, \$48,040,000, and in addition, \$500,000 which shall be derived by transfer from Civil Defense Procurement Fund established by the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (50 U.S.C. App. 2264): *Provided*, That not to exceed \$19,100,000 shall be available for allocation under section 205 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended.

65 Stat. 61.

72 Stat. 533;
78 Stat. 231.
50 USC app.
2286.

RESEARCH, SHELTER SURVEY AND MARKING

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for studies and research to develop measures and plans for civil defense; and continuing shelter surveys, marking, stocking, and equipping surveyed spaces; \$12,500,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—CIVIL DEFENSE

Appropriations contained in this Act for carrying out civil defense activities shall not be available in excess of the limitations on appropriations contained in section 408 of the Federal Civil Defense Act, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2260).

64 Stat. 1257;
72 Stat. 534.

No part of any appropriation in this Act shall be available for the construction of warehouses or for the lease of warehouse space in any building which is to be constructed specifically for civil defense activities.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY OR HANDICAPPED FUND

73 Stat. 667; For the revolving fund established pursuant to section 202 of the
79 Stat. 457. Housing Act of 1959, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701q et seq.), \$25,000,000,
to remain available until expended.

ALASKA HOUSING

42 USC 3371. For assistance in the provision of housing and related facilities for
Alaska natives and other Alaska residents, as authorized by section
1004 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act
of 1966 (80 Stat. 1284-1285), \$1,000,000.

GRANTS FOR NEIGHBORHOOD FACILITIES

79 Stat. 491. For grants authorized by section 703 of the Housing and Urban
Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3103), \$35,000,000, to remain
available until expended.

LOW RENT PUBLIC HOUSING ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

50 Stat. 891. For the payment of annual contributions to public housing agencies
in accordance with section 10 of the United States Housing Act of
1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1410), \$350,000,000.

URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAMS

63 Stat. 414; For grants for urban renewal, fiscal year 1970, as an additional
68 Stat. 622; amount for urban renewal programs, as authorized by title I of the
79 Stat. 457, Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1450 et seq.) and section
477. 314 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1452a),
68 Stat. 629. \$750,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no
78 Stat. 792. part of any appropriation in this Act shall be used for administrative
expenses in connection with commitments for grants aggregating more
than the total of amounts available in the current year from the
amounts authorized for making such commitments through June 30,
1968, plus the additional amounts appropriated therefor.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary administrative expenses of programs of renewal and
housing assistance, not otherwise provided for, \$34,000,000.

METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT

URBAN PLANNING GRANTS

For an additional amount for "Urban planning grants", \$43,838,000,
to remain available until expended.

OPEN SPACE LAND PROGRAMS

For grants as authorized by title VII of the Housing Act of 1961, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1500-1500e), and the provision of technical assistance to State and local public bodies (including the undertaking of studies and publication of information), \$75,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation in this Act shall be used for administrative expenses in connection with commitments entered into during the current fiscal year for grants aggregating more than the total amounts available in the current year from amounts heretofore appropriated for making such commitments through June 30, 1967, plus the additional amount appropriated herein: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation may be used for financing a grant in excess of 50 per centum of the cost of any activity or project.

75 Stat. 183;
79 Stat. 494;
80 Stat. 1279.

GRANTS FOR BASIC WATER AND SEWER FACILITIES

For grants authorized by section 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3102), \$165,000,000, to remain available until expended.

79 Stat. 490.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary administrative expenses of programs of metropolitan development, not otherwise provided for, \$7,000,000.

DEMONSTRATIONS AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

MODEL CITIES PROGRAMS

For financial assistance and administrative expenses in connection with planning and carrying out comprehensive city demonstration programs, as authorized by title I of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (80 Stat. 1255-1261), including \$312,500,000 for grants for urban renewal projects within approved city demonstration programs, to be transferred to and merged with the appropriation "Urban renewal programs" for the fiscal year 1969 in accordance with and subject to the provisions of section 113 of said Act, \$625,000,000: *Provided*, That the amount appropriated herein for other than urban renewal programs shall remain available until June 30, 1970.

42 USC 3301-
3313.

80 Stat. 1260.
42 USC 1453.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT TRAINING PROGRAMS

For matching grants to States for training and related activities, and for expenses of providing technical assistance to State and local governmental or public bodies (including studies and publication of information), as authorized by title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964 (20 U.S.C. 801-805), \$3,000,000.

78 Stat. 802.

FELLOWSHIPS FOR CITY PLANNING AND URBAN STUDIES

For fellowships for city planning and urban studies as authorized by section 810 of the Housing Act of 1964 (20 U.S.C. 811), \$500,000.

81 Stat. 167.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary administrative expenses of programs of demonstrations and intergovernmental relations, not otherwise provided for, \$1,400,000, together with not to exceed \$6,000,000 to be derived from the appropriation for "Model cities programs": *Provided*, That no part of this or any other appropriation in this Act may be used to

provide metropolitan expeditors, or for the administration or implementation of section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-754).

80 Stat. 1262.
42 USC 3334.

URBAN RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

For necessary expenses of programs of research and studies relating to housing and urban problems, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by law (12 U.S.C. 1701d-3; 1701e; 1701f; 79 Stat. 668; 80 Stat. 1286-1287), \$11,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$500,000 of the foregoing amount shall be available for administrative expenses.

70 Stat. 1113;
63 Stat. 431.
42 USC 3531
et seq., 3372,
3373.

LOW INCOME HOUSING DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS

For low income housing demonstration programs pursuant to section 207 of the Housing Act of 1961, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1436), \$2,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation in this Act shall be available for administrative expenses in connection with contracts to make grants in excess of the amount herein appropriated.

75 Stat. 165;
79 Stat. 503.

MORTGAGE CREDIT

RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM

For rent supplement payments authorized by section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, \$12,000,000: *Provided*, That the limitation otherwise applicable to the maximum payments that may be required in any fiscal year by all contracts entered into under such section is increased by \$30,000,000: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation or contract authority shall be used for incurring any obligation in connection with any dwelling unit or project which is not either part of a workable program for community improvement meeting the requirements of section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1451(c)), or which is without local official approval for participation in this program.

79 Stat. 451.
12 USC 1701s.

68 Stat. 623.

For necessary administrative expenses of the Federal Housing Administration in carrying out functions under section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, delegated by the Secretary, \$1,350,000.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

For necessary administrative expenses of the Secretary, not otherwise provided for, in overall program planning and direction in the Department, including not to exceed \$2,500 for official reception and representation expenses, \$6,000,000.

REGIONAL MANAGEMENT AND SERVICES

For necessary administrative expenses, not otherwise provided for, of management and program coordination in the regional offices of the Department, \$6,500,000.

PAYMENT OF PARTICIPATION SALES INSUFFICIENCIES

For the payment of such insufficiencies as may be required by the Federal National Mortgage Association, as trustee, on account of outstanding beneficial interests or participations in assets of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (including the Federal

National Mortgage Association) authorized by law to be issued pursuant to section 302(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act, as amended, \$47,638,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 102. Where appropriations in this title are expendable for travel expenses of employees and no specific limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures for such travel expenses may not exceed the amounts set forth therefor in the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to travel performed by uncompensated officials of local boards and appeal boards of the Selective Service System; to travel performed in connection with the investigation of aircraft accidents by the Civil Aeronautics Board; to travel performed directly in connection with care and treatment of medical beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration; or to payments to interagency motor pool where separately set forth in the budget schedules.

SEC. 103. No part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be available to pay the salary of any person filling a position, other than a temporary position, formerly held by an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces of the United States and has satisfactorily completed his period of active military or naval service and has within ninety days after his release from such service or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than one year made application for restoration to his former position and has been certified by the Civil Service Commission as still qualified to perform the duties of his former position and has not been restored thereto.

SEC. 104. No part of any appropriation made available by the provisions of this title shall be used for the purchase or sale of real estate or for the purpose of establishing new offices outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to programs which have been approved by the Congress and appropriations made therefor.

TITLE III—CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies, respectively, are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the Budget for the current fiscal year for each such corporation or agency, except as herein-after provided:

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES,
FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Not to exceed a total of \$5,000,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, which may procure services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and contracts for such services with one organization may be renewed annually, and uniforms or allowances therefor in accordance with law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902), and said amount shall be derived from funds available to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, including those in the Federal Home Loan Bank Board revolving fund and receipts of the Board for the current fiscal year and prior fiscal years, and the Board may

78 Stat. 800;
80 Stat. 164,
1236.
12 USC 1717.
Travel ex-
penses.

Positions of
employees
entering
Armed Forces.

Real estate
purchase or
sale, restric-
tion.

61 Stat. 584.
31 USC 849.

80 Stat. 416.

80 Stat. 508;
81 Stat. 206.

47 Stat. 729.
 80 Stat. 1028.
 12 USC 1426,
 1464.
 80 Stat. 1036;
 73 Stat. 691.
 12 USC 1730,
 1730a.

utilize and may make payment for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and other agencies of the Government (including payment for office space): *Provided*, That all necessary expenses in connection with the conservatorship of institutions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation or activities relating to section 6(i) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, section 5(d) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, or section 407 or 408 of the National Housing Act and all necessary expenses (including services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the handling, including the purchase, sale, and exchange, of securities on behalf of Federal home-loan banks, and the sale, issuance, and retirement of, or payment of interest on, debentures or bonds, under the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further*, That members and alternates of the Federal Savings and Loan Advisory Council shall be entitled to reimbursement from the Board as approved by the Board for transportation expenses incurred in attendance at meetings of or concerned with the work of such Council and may be paid not to exceed \$25 per diem in lieu of subsistence: *Provided further*, That expenses of any functions of supervision (except of Federal home-loan banks) vested in or exercisable by the Board shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$1,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the administrative expenses and other obligations of the Board shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act of July 22, 1932, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1421-1449): *Provided further*, That the nonadministrative expenses (except those included in the first proviso hereof) for the supervision and examination of Federal and State chartered institutions (other than special examinations determined by the Board to be necessary) shall not exceed \$14,396,000.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

Not to exceed \$340,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis and shall be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation, properly capitalized expenditures, expenses in connection with liquidation of insured institutions or activities relating to section 407 or 408 of the National Housing Act, liquidation or handling of assets of or derived from insured institutions, payment of insurance, and action for or toward the avoidance, termination, or minimizing of losses in the case of insured institutions, legal fees and expenses, and payments for expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board determined by said Board to be properly allocable to said Corporation, and said Corporation may utilize and may make payments for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and other agencies of the Government: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the administrative expenses and other obligations of said Corporation shall be incurred, allowed and paid in accordance with title IV of the Act of June 27, 1934, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1724-1730b).

48 Stat. 1255.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN
DEVELOPMENT

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, HOUSING FOR THE
ELDERLY OR HANDICAPPED

Not to exceed \$1,272,000 of funds in the revolving fund established pursuant to section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701q et seq.), shall be available for administrative expenses.

73 Stat. 667;
79 Stat. 457.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, COLLEGE HOUSING LOANS

Not to exceed \$2,275,000 shall be available for all administrative expenses of carrying out the program of housing loans to educational institutions (12 U.S.C. 1749-1749d).

64 Stat. 77;
77 Stat. 437.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, PUBLIC FACILITY LOANS

Not to exceed \$1,227,000 of funds in the revolving fund established pursuant to title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955, as amended, shall be available for administrative expenses.

69 Stat. 642.
42 USC 1491-
1497.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, REVOLVING FUND
(LIQUIDATING PROGRAMS)

During the current fiscal year not to exceed \$100,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, but this amount shall be exclusive of expenses necessary in the case of defaulted obligations to protect the interests of the Government.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES,
FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

For administrative expenses in carrying out duties imposed by or pursuant to law, not to exceed \$11,675,000 of the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration shall be available, in accordance with the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701): *Provided*, That funds shall be available for contract actuarial services (not to exceed \$1,500): *Provided further*. That nonadministrative expenses classified by section 2 of Public Law 387, approved October 25, 1949, shall not exceed \$93,000,000.

48 Stat. 1246.

63 Stat. 905.
12 USC 1702.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL NATIONAL
MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

Not to exceed \$10,000,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, which shall be on accrual basis, and shall be exclusive of interest paid, expenses (including expenses for fiscal agency services performed on a contract or fee basis) in connection with the issuance and servicing of securities, depreciation, properly capitalized expenditures, fees for servicing mortgages, expenses (including services performed on a force account, contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, protection, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to said Association or in which it has an interest, cost of salaries, wages, travel, and other expenses of persons employed outside of the continental United States, and all administrative expenses reimbursable from other Government agencies: *Provided*, That the distribution of administrative expenses to the accounts of the Association shall be made in accordance with generally recognized accounting principles and practices.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, LOW RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

50 Stat. 888.

Administrative expenses of carrying out the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1401-1433) shall be provided for from amounts appropriated therefor in this Act, except that necessary expenses of providing representatives at the sites of non-Federal projects in connection with the construction of such projects by public housing agencies with aid under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, shall be compensated by such agencies by the payment of fixed fees which in the aggregate will cover the costs of rendering such services, and expenditures for such purpose shall be considered nonadministrative expenses, and funds received from such payments may be used only for the payment of necessary expenses of providing such representatives.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Publicity or
propaganda.

SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress.

Personnel work.

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one hundred and thirty-five, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the corporation or agency concerned: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half-time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

Uniforms, etc.

80 Stat. 508;
81 Stat. 206.
80 Stat. 416.

SEC. 303. Appropriations and funds available for the administrative expenses of the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall be available in the current fiscal year for purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902); hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

Legal and bank-
ing services.

SEC. 304. Funds made available for the Department of Housing and Urban Development under title III of this Act shall be available, without regard to the limitations on administrative expenses, for legal services on a contract or fee basis, and for utilizing and making payment for services and facilities of Federal National Mortgage Association, Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, Federal home-loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811-1831).

64 Stat. 873.

Research proj-
ects.

SEC. 305. None of the funds provided herein shall be used to pay any recipient of a grant for the conduct of a research project an amount equal to as much as the entire cost of such project.

SEC. 306. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

Interdepart-
mental groups,
expenses.

SEC. 307. None of the funds in this Act shall be available to finance interdepartmental boards, commissions, councils, committees, or similar groups under sec. 214 of the Independent Offices Appropriation

Act, 1946 (31 U.S.C. 691) which do not have prior and specific Congressional approval of such method of financial support, except that during the fiscal year 1969, appropriations of interested departments and agencies made in this and other appropriation Acts shall be available, in aggregate amounts not to exceed those listed herein, for contributions toward expenses of the following committees: President's Council on Youth Opportunity, \$357,000; Interagency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs, \$485,000; U.S.—Mexico Commission for Border Development and Friendship, \$300,000; National Council on Indian Opportunity, \$100,000. 59 Stat. 134.

Sec. 308. No part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to pay the salary of any Federal employee who is convicted in any Federal, State, or local court of competent jurisdiction, of inciting, promoting, or carrying on a riot, or any group activity resulting in material damage to property or injury to persons, found to be in violation of Federal, State, or local laws designed to protect persons or property in the community concerned. Payments prohibited to convicted rioters.

This Act may be cited as the "Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriation Act, 1969". Short title.

Approved October 4, 1968.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY:

HOUSE REPORTS: No. 1348 (Comm. on Appropriations) and No. 1904 (Comm. of Conference).

SENATE REPORT No. 1375 (Comm. on Appropriations).

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 114 (1968):

May 8, Sept. 19: Considered and passed House.

July 17, 18, Sept. 25: Considered and passed Senate.

468 A
1 B